DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 359 138 SO 023 189

AUTHOR	Bjerstedt, Ake, Ed.
TITLE	Fifty Peace Educators: Self-Portraits in Passing from Twenty-Two Countries. Peace Education Reports No. 7.
INSTITUTION	Lund Univ. (Sweden). Malmo School of Education.
REPORT NO	ISSN-1101-6426
PUB DATE	Apr 93
NOTE	82p.
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Global Approach; Higher Education; *International Education; Interviews; *Peace; *Personal Narratives; Teaching Experience
IDENTIFIERS	*Peace Education

ABSTRACT

The project group "Preparedness for Peace" of the Department of Education and Psychological Research, Malmo School of Education, Sweden, explores ways of helping children and young people deal constructively with questions of peace and war. As part of its work, the project group collects viewpoints on the role of schools in pursuit of "peace preparedness." In this regard, experts with special interests and competencies in areas related to peace education have been interviewed by the project. This document presents excerpts from interviews with 50 peace educators representing 22 different countries. Answers given by interviewees to the question "As an introduction, could you say a few words about yourself and your interest in the field of peace education?" are the focus of the report. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED359138

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
AKE BJERSTEDT
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SO 023 189

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FIFTY PEACE EDUCATORS: SELF-PORTRAITS IN PASSING FROM TWENTY-TWO COUNTRIES

Åke Bjerstedt (Ed.)

During the seventies and eighties, an increasing number of educators and researchers have taken an interest in, and worked with, peace education. Who are these people; what motivates them to start working in this difficult area; and what are they doing? The present report will help the reader to acquire some idea about possible answers to these questions by presenting "self-portraits in passing" (based on interviews) of fifty peace educators representing twenty-two different countries.

Keywords: Global approach, interviews, non-violence, peace education, peace research, war.

Introduction

During the seventies and eighties, an increasing number of educators and researchers have taken an interest in, and worked with, peace education. It is not a big group, but you will find them in many different countries. Who are these people; what motivates them to start working in this difficult new area; and what are they doing?

The present report will help the reader to acquire some idea about possible answers to these questions by presenting "self-portraits in passing" of fifty peace educators representing twenty-two different countries.

The background is this. The project group "Preparedness for Peace", working at the Department of Educational and Psychological Research, Malmö School of Education in Sweden, explores ways of helping children and young people to deal constructively with questions of peace and war. As part of its work, the project group collects viewpoints on the role of schools in pursuit of "peace preparedness". A number of experts with a special interest and competence in areas related to peace education have been interviewed.

Each interview starts with this question: "As an introduction, could you say a few words about yourself and your interest in the field of 'peace education'?" This report presents the answers to this introductory probe. All interviews were made by the editor, and they were carried out over several years in many different surroundings and situations. Sometimes we had limited time for the total interview, and the answers to the introductory question have by necessity been fairly brief. At other times we had plenty of time, and the resulting self-portraits could be richer in detail.

My hope is that, after reading these "portraits in passing", the reader will have obtained some useful ideas both about peace education in general and about this pioneer group of peace educators.

Å.B.

Susan Alexander (Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA)

Concern with the nuclear arms race was in focus in the early 80s. I left teaching and became involved in Educators for Social Responsibility (ESR). Besides the nuclear issues, we emphasized the concepts of war and peace and ideas in our country about the Soviet Union. Now we see "social responsibility" as a broad concept; peace education can be regarded as one aspect of education for social responsibility.

Robert Aspeslagh (Amsterdam, The Netherlands)

I think that at the time it was a matter of luck that I entered the field of peace education. I was a primary-school teacher. I was not satisfied with my teacher training program. So one day I decided not to continue my training, and my teacher said to me: "It is a real pity, but I know a school that may be interesting for you." So he gave me an address. I entered that school – there was something happening. I said, my goodness, this I have never experienced before.

The school, I discovered, was working on the basis of the ideas of a Dutch pedagogue, Boeke, who was never mentioned in our training. Once he was put in prison for being a total conscientious objector and pacifist, a Christian anti-militarist. Thus the school was based on pacifist, non-violent anti-militaristic ideas, which were translated into pedagogy. I taught there for ten years without knowing that it was peace education that I was doing.

After ten years I decided that it was time to go away, because you should not be a teacher within the same school too long, even if you love it. Then, by chance, I saw an advertisement about a job in peace education. I applied for the job and I got it, and then I started to read and to think about peace education. My task was research and curriculum development.

When I look at my own "history", the real background may be the fact that I am a victim of war. The first years of my life were spent in a Japanese concentration camp in Indonesia. I experienced cruelty, killingand starvation as a young child. And I still experience them.

So this is how I entered this field. At the present time I have to be very modest about my practical skills in education, because it is a long time ago – about ten years – that I was an active teacher.

Anima Bose (New Delhi, India)

My area of studies has been history, especially modern history of India, and sociology. When I came to America in 1965, I was teaching history of India under "India Study". But my students at the university told me: Really we don't want to study history of India – we want to study about Gandhi. I said: Yes, I could initiate Gandhian Study if your university will allow it; and I got the permission. Because of teaching this particular course, I myself studied Gandhi in greater depth, and it led to some rethinking. Since then I have teaching nothing but Gandhian studies and peace education in the academia.

I have also written books – out of my nine books, three are devoted to peace-related topics: One is about peace movements and history, the other is about Gandhi, and the third deals with dimensions of peace and nonviolence in our time. The other six books are related to higher education, literature etc.

Elise Boulding (Boulder, Colorado, USA)

I began thinking about the peace education field in the years when I was a mother and a full-time home-maker. We have five children and I spent a great deal of time with other mothers in our Quaker community in Michigan, talking about ways in which we could influence our children. What did we need to do as parents? What needed to be done in the community? What were we concerned about in the schools that would help our children grow up to be peacemakers?

Later when the children were grown, I went back to university and took a Ph.D. in sociology and then came to this problem area as a researcher and university teacher. But the most important influence I really think was when our own children were small, thinking about what it would be growing up in our country and how children could possibly become peacemakers in an environment that was so imbued with the cold war.

I had been a peace activist during the years our children were growing up, and part of my motivation in going back to the university was to understand how economic, political and social systems work, so that we could be more effective in working for peace. I was very aware of the limitations of demonstrations and peace marches and so on. I wanted to have a better

understanding of the nature of the war system and the dynamics of creating a peace system.

My doctoral dissertation was on the effects of modernization on women's roles, and working on that problem led me to understand that the routes that women have travelled for participation in their society have been very different in different parts of the world. In my historical work on "The Underside of History" I go back and look at women from prehistory to the present and try to trace the kind of world that women had in different societies – nomadic, urban and rural. In the course of doing that I became very conscious that women's roles have tended either to keep the society going during a war or be involved in reconstruction after the war. To a very limited extent women themselves have been warriors, but their primary task has been to keep the society going so it could fight wars. This is of course not a way that one likes to think about it, but it is in fact what women have done historically. That was one set of researches that made me very conscious of women's capacity for both violence and for nurturance. I became aware of the need consciously to make choices and to analyze one's role in the society to see the consequences of one's choices. That is something that women have not adequately done in the past. I think they are now much more conscious of the impact of the whole range of women's roles on the degree of peace culture or war culture that a society has. Many different studies I have done relate to that issue in one way or another.

Then I looked at child development and the possibility for participation of children in society. I have asked the same kinds of questions about children's roles that I have asked about women's roles. What in fact do children contribute to the shaping of the societies they live in? Again it is invisible. In most countries in the world, children enter the labour force at the age of four, that is they have to help in the family enterprise. In farming and nomadic societies there are important chores that small children do. In war time children become the maintainers of the society when the men are away and the women are overworked. Both war heroes and peace heroes are found among children. My book "Children's Rights in the Wheel of Life" documents a little bit of that – you might say it's the underside of history from the child's perspective rather than from the woman's perspective.

Then my work in translating Fred Polak's "The Image of the Future" from Dutch to English made me very aware of the role of images of the future held by both individuals and societies in determining what people do

in the present – how they respond to their environment. I became very conscious that disarmament as a goal was accompanied by a complete inability to imagine what a society would be like and how it would function if in fact disarmament would take place. So in 1981, with a colleague Warren Ziegler, I began devising a type of workshop which takes people 30 years into the future and says: We are in a world now, in which there are no buttons for nuclear war: What does it look like? This is an exercise in free-floating imagining. There is also a very strong analytic component after the workshop members have made a fantasy visit to this future world. They must figure out in the analytic mode what are the kinds of institutions that would sustain the society they saw in their fantasies. This is an instrument I have used to empower people for action in the present. They have to imagine the history that would get them from 1988 to 2018 – something must have happened to get to this new situation! They invent the history, and then they decide: what should they do now that would help bring that world about? It is an exercise for empowerment into action.

I have also been very interested in the problems of religion. It is an intellectual challenge to understand the role of religion in society. I am very aware that religion has legimated and motivated war over and over again historically; and yet, religion is also the source of some of the greatest teachings on how to live without war.

Birgit Brock-Utne (Oslo, Norway)

In a way, I think that I became unterested in this field even as a child, as the daughter of a German mother. My Mother came to Norway just before the war, and I was born just before the war broke out. She had been forced to leave her job because she was so strongly anti-Nazi, and she married my father. I learned to speak German, since my mother knew very little Norwegian. At the same time, my father was working in an underground movement against the Germans. As a child during the war, I learned that one was not to speak German on the street, and I learned, for example, not to sing German lullabies. For a long time in Norway, it was important to be bad in German in school. Since the Germans were so hated I got into fights in the schoolyard, because I was teased for being the daughter of a German. At the same time, of course, I liked my mother and my maternal grandmother. I Therefore realized very early that there are differences between

governments and people, and that not all Germans were dangerous or wicked. I think I probably became interested at an early stage in trying to understand how prejudices about groups arise, and what we can do to counteract that.

Then I went to high school, enrolled in an experimental course connected with UNESCO's Associated Schools Project. We studied the same subjects as those in the ordinary English course, but the content and the emphasis were different. We paid a lot of attention to the United Nations system and the declaration of human, rights, for example. That meant a lot to me.

After graduation, I received a scholarship to the U.S.A. and there I became involved in something called the Model United Nations, arranged by American universities every year: a mock United Nations conference, where the participants go through the whole agenda that is to be taken up in the U.N., and where different universities play the roles of different nations. Stanford University, which I was attending, represented the United States. I was on the committee for social and human rights, and I was supposed to represent the U.S.A. These experiences undoubtedly contributed to my interest in the field we are discussing now, and I have subsequently, during my continuing studies, become very absorbed with questions concerning war, peace and prejudices in many connections.

Among other things, in 1975 I made an investigation into children's attitudes towards foreign countries, and I have had occasion to refer to that study in various situations. I worked with the Ministry for Church and Education for three years. There I was asked a number of times to speak about peace education by Under Secretary of State Ingrid Eide, whom I knew as a colleague at the university.

Then I was appointed by the Norwegian UNESCO Commission to lead a group that was to prepare for Norway's participation in the World Disarmament Education Congress, arranged by UNESCO in 1980. Among other things, I then wrote an article on disarmament education in Norway. That led to an invitation from researchers at the Peace Research Institute in Oslo (PRIO) – who often received questions about peace education, but who had not worked very much in that area – to work there on issues involved in peace education for a year.

That meant that I began to work more systematically on peace education matters. At that same time, I also received a UNESCO assignment concerning women's role, as mothers, in fostering peace. It was probably when I began to work on that assignment that the importance of combining re-

search about women and women's education with peace issues first occurred to me. It is actually quite amazing how seldom those engaged in peace education look into the extraordinary differences in our ordinary rearing of girls and boys where violence and aggression are concerned.

That became an important theme in my report to UNESCO, and then in the book where I developed it further, "Educating for Peace: A Feminist Perspective" (New York: Pergamon Press, 1985). The book had the character of a debate, and it provoked several kinds of reactions. One professor in Australia, who used the publication as a textbook, thought it would be a good idea if I were to come out, for example, with a new version going more systematically into a number of feminist perspectives. The book is used at several universities in the U.S., not only in peace studies but in other areas as well. It was an important inspiration to develop my thinking further when, in the spring of 1986, I was a key note lecturer at the University of Oregon. In the spring of 1987 I was invited on a lecturing tour of other American universities, among them the University of Illinois, Indiana University and Ohio State University. Another source of inspiration was the Forum for Women's Studies at Umeå University, Sweden. I was scholar-in-residence there in the fall of 1986, and lectured on feminist theories about peace and peace education. With the help of a research leave from my university, and with tutorial assistance primarily from Håkan Wiberg, I revised my work further, into a more academic version, "Feminist Perspectives on Peace and Peace Education". That version was my doctoral dissertation, defended in Oslo (June 1988) – The first doctorate in Norway in peace research. I have now revised it as a book, published by Pergamon Press in 1989.

I have also touched on this theme in a background document for the UN Decade for Women conference in Nairobi in 1985 (a document that was at first regarded as too feminist), and in a contribution to the IPRA Conference in Sussex in 1986. Among other things, I have played different feminist perspectives off against one another: one, more liberal, focusing on equality and non-discrimination, and the other, more radical, stressing liberation from traditional and capitalist structures and the creation of something new. There is an important difference between "getting a bigger share of the pie" and "changing the basic recipe of the pie". In this work I have also had the support and inspiration of other women peace researchers; we have a network, and we thought that the meeting we had in Sussex was good in many ways.

ÅB: In addition to working with surveys of research and theories, you are apparently also involved in empirical work on the rearing of sons. Can you say something about that?

BB: Yes. That has to do with my interest in male socialization, in how we bring up our boys. I have been interested in the possibility of "legitimizing a new kind of man", and have given thoughts to the possibilities of giving a man status in ways other than through aggression and violence.

What I am involved with concretely now is a three-year research project, supported by NAVF, going on until 1990. I have a male assistent, Bjørnar Sarnes. We are interviewing 40 mothers and 40 fathers who have sons. One half of the group of mothers are "feminist oriented" (they don't have to call themselves feminists, but they must have had contact with, and associate themselves with, the women's movement, and they must have been employed fulltime while their sons were small), while the other half of the mothers are "housewives" (they have stayed at home and do not associate themselves with the women's movement). We have two similar groups among the fathers. One-half are "critical of sex-roles and conscious", i.e. they are men who have involved themselves in the debate about sex roles and who have spent more time than usual with children; in other words, they are men who have problematized the male role. (We got in touch with some of them through a crisis center for men.) The other half consists of a more traditional group of men.

We conduct extended (hour-and-a-half) in-depth interviews with the mothers and fathers. The format is a structured conversation, where we touch upon their goals as parents of sons, and their aspirations for their sons' development. We ask specifically what their sons usually do (what leisure activities they have and what contributions they make at home, as members of the household). We inquire about how our respondents feel about violence, and about military service. We also ask the fathers about their attitudes towards this business of being a man, and we ask the mothers about their definition of the "ideal man". If daughters are also part of the family, we ask the parents if they make any distinction between rearing sons and daughters.

Thus far, I have analyzed the first seven interviews with mothers, and written a little article based on this preliminary material. The article is included in a book I have edited in collaboration with my assistent (Brock-Utne, B. & Sarnes, B. (Eds.) "Når gutter blir menn" /"When Boys Become Men"/. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1987),a book that includes such con-

tributions as studies of how boys play in playgrounds, observations of men in bars and restaurants, etc.

It is too early to draw any final conclusions based on our interviews, because we have analyzed only part of the material. But what has astonished me in these first analyses is how afraid even the "feminist" mothers have been to intrude too much on the upbringing of boys, how little they have done to alter traditional sex-role patterns. A certain influence has occurred with regard to household chores – getting boys to accept more of the common duties, or teaching them to use sewing machines, and so on. On the other hand, they do almost nothing to prevent boys from playing war games and being violent outside the home.

It's an entirely different situation when it comes to daughters. The "feminists" have often tried to influence their daughters strongly. They buy their daughters football helmets, and try to encourage them to be tough, strong and independent. They obviously want the girls to measure up to their own ideals for a feminist. But they seem to be afraid of intervening too much when it comes to boys. I can frankly say that I am somewhat disappointed in this regard. I had hoped that mothers with a feminist attitude would have wanted to rear their sons to become gentle and non-sexist men.

ÅB: You surely have a number of personal experiences in this respect?

BB: Yes, I have, and they have contributed to my involvement in these issues. I have been acutely aware of the sex-role problems in my relations with my sons, and I have seen how difficult it can be to deviate from the traditional ones. I have found it much easier to educate my daughter who can just model herself after me and who has become assertive and outspoken.

My oldest son, Karsten, had one period full of problems as a child. For a while he had trouble making friends, because he was different: he drew, he worked with pottery, and he was full of imagination; on top of that he had a mother who didn't let him have war toys or get into fights. When he was 14 or 15, he rebelled against me for the first time: he was going to take up karate. We had heated discussions, where I said that I did not like violence, but that I had to respect his right to decide what he wanted to do. He, for his part, thought that I ought to admit that it could be good for him. In retrospect, I believe he was right. His non-violent upbringing had made him feel a need to know that he was physically strong, that he needn't be afraid to intervene if the occasion should arise. He wanted to be in good physical condition, to be able to show he was not afraid, to be able to ski on one foot

– things like that.

When he got to be 16 and 17, it was easier. That may have partly been associated with our moving to Tromsø, where he made new friends. Eventually, he became something of an "ideal man" as far as I was concerned, my best example of peace fostering. He also became a conscientious objector. He participated in peace marches and always had the broken rifle symbol on his jacket. As you know, he died in an auto accident, and I have written about him in a book where I talk about my grief but also about the education of a boy to pacifism. ("En mors tåre: Vi som mister våre barn på veiene" /"A Mother's Tears: We Who Lose Our Children On The Highways"/ Oslo: Ida forlag og bokverksted, 1986.) That book, incidentally, has been much discussed in Norway. It appears to have helped many people handle their grief, and every week I receive letters from people who are grateful for the book. It is also used in the nurses' training programs in Oslo and in psychology courses at the University of Bergen.

Karsten's youngest brother, Gunnar, who is now 11 and attends the Swedish School in Dar es Salaam, has had problems like his brother's. He, too, has problems with friends, and with being a little different. He is very articulate and likes to talk about things, but he is no football-player. He prefers to sing and draw.

By the way, I have recently given a lecture for the Nordic association of sports researchers, in which I spoke on "Masculinity, Sports and Education for Violence", and talked a little about my sons. Sports can involve both "power to" and "power over", but in my view the trend has been far too much towards "power over". You must be aggressive on the soccer field to be respected, and everything centers on competition. In my opinion, competition receives too much emphasis both in sports and in school. That, incidentally, was also the reason for our deciding to send Gunnar to the Swedish School, and not the International School, while we are in Tanzania. The International School has a rigid system of competition and grading.

Robin Burns (Heidelberg, Victoria, Australia)

My background is in development education from the late 60s onwards and particularly through the organization World University Service. As part of that in 1974 I was doing a survey for the Food and Agricultural Organization program. At a conference I met Robin Richardson and Christoph

Wulf who then were in charge of the Peace Education Commission of IPRA (International Peace Research Association). They told me about it, and they invited me to correspond with the Peace Education Commission. Finally in 1976 I came to Stockholm to work with Stig Lindholm and then in 1978 came to my first IPRA summer school. Since then I have been involved in work on the relationship between peace and development education.

James Calleja (Valletta, Malta)

I am a graduate in education of the University of Malta from where I obtained my Bachelor's Degree. Then I moved on to the University of Padua in Italy where I undertook research in the philosophy of education. I recently got my Ph.D. from the Department of Peace Studies of the University of Bradford. My thesis dealt with Kant's philosophy of peace and history.

I got interested in peace education mainly after I had met Helena Kekkonen in 1987. After that I was given the opportunity in Malta, through the Foundation for International Studies, to start a program on peace education. We first organized a national seminar for teachers in particular, education advisers and principals from both public and private schools. Helena Kekkonen was then invited, to give some lectures. The proceedings of that seminar were published in a book (Calleja, J., Busuttil, S. & Kekkonen, H. /Eds./ Directions in the study of peace education. Valletta, Malta: Said, 1991). This was the first national seminar on the topic in Malta, and I am pleased to say that the academic study of peace education in Malta as such started with this national seminar. This was in 1989.

Two units of studies in this area in the faculty of education of the University of Malta were then introduced. One concerns the theoretical perspectives on peace and education and the other is on the practical dimensions of peace education. Our student teachers at our faculty of education have now an opportunity to choose these units during their course of studies. They are not compulsory. They are optional, but already we have had about 60 students. Hence, 60 of our future teachers already have some basic information and have done some research on peace education.

Terry Carson (Edmonton, Alberta, Canada)

I am a high school social studies teacher by background. Since doing my doctorate I have come on the staff at the University of Alberta, where my main task is teacher education in secondary education social studies.

I see peace education as being one of the frontiers of social education. In peace education I include education for non-violence, education for development, and education for social justice.

When I look back on it, I was interested in peace education even as a teacher in the 1970s. I was very interested in the questions of economic development and Third World issues. My more recent interest came about later as a result of the debate on the nuclear threat in 1982. I was very concerned over the arms race. There was a lot of concern in the media in Canada and in the United States.

ÅB: I understand that you plan to write a book on peace education. Can you tell me about these plans?

TC: Yes, the book is a response to the need that teachers and teacher educators have expressed for some kind of comprehensive book on peace education. The book will consist of four parts. The *first* part will qive a general overview of questions related to peace education, for example, definitions of peace and peace education. It will include various perspectives on peace. It will also deal with some of the history of peace education and it will include some of the controversies over peace education. The *second* part of the book deals with approaches to teaching peace educatlon through the subject areas. There will be four chapters in that part of the book, dealing wlth the humanities, the arts, the sciences, and the languages. And then the *third* part of the book has to do wlth cross-curricular concerns in peace education, looklng at things like education for non-violence, conflict resolution, environmental education, and disarmament education. The *fourth* part will conclude with chapters on peace education and the ethos of the school. – My co-author will be David Smith at McGill University.

AB: Do you work with peace education questions in some other way at present?

TC: Yes, I am also interested in the way that teachers implement peace education, related to my general research interest in curriculum change and curriculum implementation. What I am wondering is: What is there about the conditions in schools that allow teachers to see the need for peace education? What is there within teachers which encouraqes them to thlnk about

peace education? So I have been working on a project we call "Action research in peace education". I meet once in three weeks with a group of teachers and we have talked about the need for peace education in schools. The participants come from many different kind of schools: Some came from inner-city schools, which have a lot of immigrant children and pupils with low social-economic background; other teachers came from very affluent areas where the parents were very interested in the academic achievement of their children; we also have teachers from a Catholic high school where many aspects of peace education were explicitly part of their program. We discuss peace education in relation to the needs in their schools, and difficulties experienced implementing peace education. We find that in these discussions we all contribute different perspectives of peace education. So we have been engaged in a process of cooperative learning, in action.

James Collinge (Wellington, New Zealand)

I first became interested in peace issues in the 1960s when I was very much involved in the campaign for nuclear disarmament, to some extent in Britain, where I lived for some time. I was working in the campaign for nuclear disarmament in Auckland in New Zealand. I was on the committe of that campaign. I was also involved in the anti-Vietnam war movement in the 1960s and have for many years been involved in the anti-apartheid movement.

I have taught both in primary and secondary school. My first job was teaching music, and I have always had a great interest in the arts in education and its relationship with peace education, particularly through the work of Herbert Read, whom I have studied especially and dealt with in a thesis.

I first became interested in teaching peace education in universities in the middle of the 1980s. We had a new government in New Zealand in 1984 which had a strong interest in peace issues and which declared New Zealand nuclear free. We have a Minister of Disarmament in the government. The Minister of Education was very enthusiastic about the notion of peace education. I felt that there was going to be a lot of development in the schools and that, as a result, I should start a course at the university. The first year that was taught was in 1985 and I have taught it regularly ever since. This

has now developed into the postgraduate area: I have a master's course in peace education and a number of thesis students who are working in the field. This has proved to be an extremely popular course in the university, at times one of the most popular in our department.

ÅB: What kind of students would come to this course?

JC: Many of our students are either teachers who are already teaching (some of them quite senior teachers who are coming back to university) or they are teachers in training, student teachers. But we do have a lot of other students who have very wide interests. We have in our department a lot of older students who have come back to the university or start at the university when their children are growing up. Many of them have a great deal of interest in peace education through raising children; they want their children to grow up in a more peaceful world. So I have quite a number of people who come to my course as parents rather than as teachers or student teachers. But I have had a very wide range of students; last year for example, I had two people from the military.

ÅB: Is your course more or less unique in your country or are there similar courses in other places?

JC: It was the first to be started. I started it as a trial course – what we would call a special field – for three years, and then it was so successful that I managed to get it accepted as a permanent course. The master's course was brought in later. There was some opposition within the university to the course being introduced, but at the time, I was on leave, so I did not hear it directly. But I heard later that people had said: Is this really the sort of course we ought to be teaching in the university?

ÅB: How would you describe the content and character of the course briefly?

JC: First of all I try to run it in a way that gives the maximum amount of opportunity for students to develop their individual work, so I do not give many lectures. We meet in groups of about 8 or 9 students regularly for seminar work. There is a great deal of emphasis on cooperative work. Students discuss their work with other students, sharing their work with other students. When we meet for lectures, to a large extent I try to get visiting people from the peace movement or other peace educators, or people like guidance counsellors who have been involved in conflict resolution in schools.

The content of the course is to a large extent as wide as the students want to make it, but we do have a strong emphasis on understanding conflict re-

solution in schools. Many of the students who are student teachers use the opportunity to develop curriculum materials. My students are, for example, very interested in environmental questions and so we spend quite a lot of time on environmental questions and their relation with peace. We deal with social justice and education in a multi-cultural society. We have also studied specific Maori approaches to the study of peace and we have then looked at some of the background of this in Maori history. For example, in the late nineteenth century there were two Maori leaders who developed non-violent means of protest, similar to the work of Gandhi. Some of my students have developed curriculum materials so that these Maori examples can be used in the schools.

Thomas Daffern (London, England)

I have been brought up in an environment related to education and peace. I was born in Montreal, in a multi-cultural context, with parents rather to the left politically, in the McCarthy period. We moved to Britain in the 60s. My mother was one of the founders of CND in Britain, and I was taken on protest marches, singing peace songs almost before I could walk. My father was a management consultant. He made some pioneering work on human relations in industry, using the concept of management by objectives back in the 50s and 60s. From both sides I inherited an interest in organization and psychology. My mother worked in European Studies in the University of Sussex in a school unit as a French teacher. My house was very much full of discussion.

My own main background area is philosophy. At an early age I decided that my real interest in life was theoretical, a concern with asking deep questions. I started reading ancient classics, but I dropped out of school very early. My experience of conventional secondary education in Britain was such that I decided that it would be better to educate myself, so I dropped out and went around the country, wrote a lot of poetry. But I ended up going to the university, taking A levels in Ancient History and English. Through reading ancient history I got very interested in classical philosophy. However, my experience of academic philosophy was disappointing again – it was at Bristol. I found it arid and dry. At the time I was only 19. One of the professors of philosophy said: I will not discuss Buddhism because it's not really philosophy, and at the same time my own

reading had convinced me of the importance of Oriental thought and the importance of global perspectives in philosophy. So I resigned.

Instead I studied three or four years in Canada on a very intensive self-directed study program, reading through the world's philosophical classics, making up my own curriculum that I hadn't been giving in university, reading source materials on Buddhist thought, on Hindu philosophy etc. I also went back and read traditional texts (Kant, Hegel etc.), putting them in a global perspective. I lived in a sort of semi-isolation, working in Canada. This was in the early 80s, at the time Reagan was elected as president. I was living in Alberta, Canada and travelled in the midwest of the United States. The climate I was living in was very split between a very small minority of Canadians being interested in peace issues and other people wanting more missiles.

The Iranian revolution was a shock to me. I had been living in a hermetically sealed environment, just doing my own studies, and as part of that I had read the Koran and other Islamic texts. Then suddenly one was confronted with the Iranian revolution, the real world. I began to realize that you just can't study alone, so I then got more involved in peace grassroots, peace work and committees. I decided to go back into the heart of the world, in a sense, partly under Quaker influence. I decided to go back to London. I went back to university to get my degree.

I chose to read history at the University of London, because I figured I had done enough philosophy. What I wanted was contemporary history, the facts, so I specialized in East-West contemporary relations, Soviet and East-European history and development. By that time I got involved with a group of philosophers looking at peace issues – Philosophers for Peace. My interest in that was just growing, and after I graduated I was working with Philosophers for Peace and also made contacts with Scientists Against Nuclear Arms, SANA, and other peace groups.

It was through those contacts that I heard about the project of the University of London to get some sort of Department of Peace Studies or a center set up. By that time I graduated and was looking for some kind of niche or work to do. So I was very excited when I discovered that project and felt it was really a work that could be seen as a continuation of my earlier interests and activities, so I got involved. We got some funding from a Quaker trust. That was in January 89. We had funding for a year which was then extended to two years. So that is really the background to my present work at the Institute of Education, University of London, where I

am now involved in various activities related to peace studies – as a teacher and a research and development officer.

Morton Deutsch (New York, USA)

Ever since I started in my graduate school training after World War II, after the atomic bombs in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, I was aware of that my work was shadowed by the atomic clouds, so to speak. Even my initial dissertation on cooperation and competition was in part stimulated by the thought that the nations of the world as represented in the Security Council might either cooperate or compete. That thought stimulated me to think about cooperation and competition, about theoretical models of cooperation and competition and to do some experimental work on cooperation and competition in groups. You might say that I turned my interest in issues of war and peace in the international arena to a theoretical investigation of cooperation and competition in a general sense.

After that initial work, I became interested in the conditions which lead to cooperation or competition, what instigates one process or the other. And that led me into a series of research investigations on conflict bargaining or negotiations, where people had a mixture of cooperative and competitive interests, and I was then interested in seeing what would influence whether that mixture would move towards a cooperative or competitive emphasis.

So most of my career has been spent on developing theory and doing research on issues that I think have some fundamental relevance to war and peace and then automatically to peace education. When I was appointed Edward Lee Thorndike Professor, a chair of psychology and education here at Columbia University, in my inaugural address I reviewed my career, and at the end I indicated that I felt it would be very important for schools of education and the Teachers College to help stimulate the development of cooperative processes in schools, to help children and adults in the schools acquire the attitudes, skills and knowledge for dealing with conflict in a more constructive fashion than is typically the case. I suggested that we should establish an institute or a center here at our College that would stimulate the dvelopment of cooperative learning and conflict resolution in the schools.

One of my former students, David Johnson, who is at the University of

Minnesota, at the Center of Cooperative Learning, and his brother Roger have been very involved and very active in developing cooperative learning within the schools here in the United States, and I felt that I wanted to further that process. David Johnson's work has been influenced by my own theories and research in this area. By the way, my initial experiment on co-operation and competition was carried out in classrooms; in fact, I created experimental classrooms that were structured so they were to be cooperative or competitive. However, that was an almost accidental feature of my research, since I happened to teach psychology classes at MIT, and using these groups meant a very convenient way for me to do my research.

So we have developed a new Center here at the Teachers College, called The International Center for Cooperation and Conflict Resolution, with the idea of stimulating further development of cooperative learning, conflict resolution and mediation in the schools and the use of constructive controversy in the classrooms. The Johnsons have been heavily involved in the use of constructive controversy.

ÅB: Is this Center also dealing with teacher education?

MD: Yes. But we are not funded by the College in any way basically. We have outside funding for research. We have a research project currently under way, working in an inner city high school. This is an alternative high school, in which we are introducing cooperative learning training for the teachers. We provide training in conflict resolution for the teachers, and they are providing that to their students, and we have trained teachers and students in mediation. We are doing some systematic, longitudinal research on the effects of this on the students in terms of their vocational achievement, their educational achievement, their mental health and their social attitudes.

I feel that the key ingredients of any program of peace education are cooperative learning, conflict resolution, mediation, and the use of constructive controversy. In addition, there are of course other elements that have to do with the specific content of international relations which I think is more appropriate for older children, while the core of peace education can in a sense be started from Kindergarten through the kinds of efforts that I mentioned.

So to summarize my answer to your first question, I have always been interested in the issue of peace and war and that has been a constant theme in my intellectual work as a social psychologist, but only in the last few years have I been directly involved in something that relates to peace edu-

cation, and that is through the Center here. Through the Center we are trying to help develop a core of people who can provide such training to teachers and administrators and also influence our College so that the training of teachers and administrators here moves more in that direction.

Virginia Floresca-Cawagas (Quezon City, The Philippines)

I am with the World Council for Curriculum and Instruction (WCCI) as member of the executive committee, national coordinator of the Philippines Chapter, and also the editor-in-chief of the FORUM, the official journal of the World Council. I first got involved in peace education in 1983 when I was invited by Betty Reardon to participate in the Second IIPE (International Institute for Peace Education) in Teachers College at Columbia University. I was there as a perticipant in 1983. She invited me the following year to lead a workshop in peace education for the secondary school level.

My initial interest and involvement was not specifically on peace education. I was working on values education as far back as 1981 when we started writing instructional programs for social responsibility in our school. Later I realized that values education and peace education address similar concerns: peace values are some of the agenda that are included in our values education program. That's how my work on peace education and values education come to interface with each other. Right now, my work is focused on arranging seminars and workshops for teachers, for them to be able to integrate peace values in their respective subjects.

ÅB: Are you at a teacher training school?

VFC: I am not officially connected to any teacher training school. In my country, several officers and members of the WCCI are commissioned by the Department of Education and Culture to take care of the values education component of the orientation program of teachers for the new elementary curriculum. So that's how I am involved: We are national trainers and we prepare training modules as well as conduct training for regional trainers.

ÅB: Have you been a classroom teacher?

VFC: Yes, I was a classroom teacher for 10 years before I became a principal. Then I was connected with a teacher training school and later with a graduate school for educational management. Right now I am not connected

officially with any of the training institutions but with the publishing industry. I am in charge of the research and planning department of one of the biggest textbook publishing houses in my country. But my professional organization is the WCCI and that's where I am fully involved in peace education.

Celina Garcia (San José, Costa Rica)

I am Celina GarcIa from Costa Rica. I come from what is perhaps a unique country in the world – a disarmed country. I don't know of any other modern democratic country in the Western hemisphere where peace is a government institution; where people would never fear war. The emphasis in our country has always been on education. It seems difficult for people outside our country to imagine what it's like in a country where there is no army. The army was abolished in 1949 symbolically, because there had never been any strong institutionalized military force.

For me, peace education is a very natural way of thinking. However, in Costa Rica, peace education doesn't exist as a separate subject. Whether we are peaceful because of our education or in spite of our education might be discussed. But at least, the culture of "civilism" – the culture of living as civilians – has been very strong in our country. It's important, I think, for people in the peace movement to know that there is a small, modern country in Latin America without an army in the midst of a part of the world characterized by oppression and militarism.

ÅB: What could be some of the historical reasons for this?

CG: It always seems easy to explain what has happened after the fact, but who could predict history? But historically, we were very poor, and I think poverty helped to save us from the rape of the Europeans. The country was inhabited by very few Indians – I think there were about 27,000 Indians when the Spanish arrived, and they made sure to kill many of them, or many of them died as a consequence of civilization, which is one of my favourite expressions from Freire. Now only very few remain in the mountains.

But in general, there is a homogeneous ethnic background. We never had clashes of cultures as in many other countries. There were never clashes of religion. Since the people who founded Costa Rica were very poor farmers from Spain, nobody really paid any attention to us, which saved our lives.

We were able to develop ourselves, practically isolated, very individualistically, with a very personal kind of culture, and with great respect for other people's ideas and political views. The country enriched itself with persecuted political refugees from outside. The people who found a home of freedom in Costa Rica enriched our educational and political life enormously.

Our first president was a teacher, and that is very meaningful to our history. I would say: If there is something important in our history, the fact that our first president was a teacher, behaved like a teacher, talked like a teacher and acted like a teacher was very, very important.

ÅB: What about your own background and interest in the area of peace education?

CG: I'm a philosopher by undergraduate education, and then I studied sociology in the United States. I lived and worked in New York for about 15 years – this is why I have a horrible New York accent. When I lived in New York, I worked a lot in the slums – in Harlem. At the time, there was a federal program that was to fund community programs. Cities who had a lot of racial problems received money for work in inner-city neighborhoods. I worked with programs for parents of Spanish and Latin American background, particularly with people from Puerto Rico, the Dominican Republic and Cuba.

I think that this work is related to my interest in work for justice and peace. Meeting Quakers was very important, and also meeting many people who at that time were working in the peace movement because of the Vietnam war. I had a very close friend Roger Woock – who now lives in Australia; he had done a Ph.D. thesis on peace education, and that attracted my interest. He is a professor in Australia right now. So meeting Roger and his wife at the time (they are divorced now) and many of the people who were deeply interested in the peace movement was important to my own development.

I heard about IPRA in the late 70s, and I began to do some research in IPRA. Then I have done teacher training in peace education in Costa Rica, and I have worked for the University for Peace.

Henk B. Gerritsma & Daan Verbaan (Groningen, The Netherlands)

HG: I was born in 1937. From 1954 to 1962 I studied geography and his-

the University of Groningen. Next I was a teacher (1962 to 1975) at a secondary school, age level 12-18, where I taught geography. Since 1974 I have been a staff member of the Institute for Peace Research (the Polemological Institute) at the University of Groningen. I belong to the section Peace Education/Education on Global Conflicts and Problems; at present I am Head of this section.

My interest in this field dates from the end of the sixties. It was influenced by the foundation of the Dutch Interchurch Peace Council (IKV) in 1967, through which public interest in the East-West conflict, in the problem of the nuclear arms race, and in the problem of underdevelopment increased strongly. Another influence was the Vietnam movement from the same period. I participated in both movements from the beginning. As a consequence, I paid attention to those conflicts and problems in my lessons.

In the same period I became involved in a peace education project at the Polemological Institute. In 1974 I was appointed a co-worker in that project, and in 1975 a staff member for peace education at the Institute. In the same year I was appointed a member of the board of the Interchurch Peace Council, with the special assignment of promoting information on problems of war and peace (both to the general public and within secondary education).

DV: I was born in 1963 in Amsterdam. In 1982 I started studying history at the University of Groningen. From the beginning of the eighties I have been engaged in the peace movement, especially the Interchurch Peace Council. These were the times of an intensive debate in the Netherlands around the deployment of cruise missiles. In my studies I took some courses on peace-and-war questions: first a course on the images of peace and war in European countries from the 16th till the 20th century; later on two courses on peace research and peace education.

In 1986 I started my work at the Polemological Institute as an assistant researcher to Mr Henk Gerritsma, one of the staff members here. In 1988 I refused military service and so I continued my job at the institute.

ÅB: Could you tell me a little about this institute and especially its section for peace education?

HG: The Polemological Institute was founded in 1962 and was the first of its kind in the Netherlands: a peace research institute with a multi-disciplinary approach. Peace education has been a special field of attention in the program of the Institute since the end of the sixties. Since the beginning of the seventies, the Polemological Institute has had a Department

for Peace Education with the general objective of promoting peace education, especially at the secondary level (age 12-18). Since 1974, usually about six persons have been involved in these activities, including two regular staff members.

The Peace Education Department tries to realize its objective by means of (a) research, (b) development of teaching materials, (c) curriculum development, and (d) various efforts to implement peace-related instruction in regular education.

With regard to research, we distinguish between development research and general research. Looking back upon the twenty years, the emphasis has been on development research. However, since the mid-eighties the emphasis has been shifting to general research. Most of the work is carried out in the form of comprehensive, several-year projects.

ÅB: Could you describe briefly one of these projects as an example of the type of work carried out?

HG: From 1977 to 1987 we carried out a project aimed at the introduction and adoption of global education in schools, in cooperation with the Centre for Peace Research at the University of Nijmegen. Using a Dutch abbreviation, we called it the INVRO project.

The emphasis was on how to promote the adoption of global education in secondary education – by the educational authorities and in the existing school subjects. The work included the development of teaching materials as well as the development of concepts and approaches attuned to and useful for secondary education. Different forms of teacher training and teacher support were also part of our activities. Our institute published seven case studies (including teacher manuals), three handbooks and several other reports from this project. (For example, you could find more information in a report I published with C.H.M. Barthelds for Unesco in 1984: "Peace Education in the Netherlands: Report on a project".)

ÅB: Daan, could you give some examples of the particular work you have been involved in here?

DV: In 1988 I travelled through West Germany and Great Britain to make an inventory of different views of peace education in those countries. – In 1989 I started working on a special project on how to include peace-related themes in different school subjects. – In 1990 I got involved in the Institute's cooperation project with the Pedagogical Institute in Murmansk (USSR), dealing with East-West and especially Soviet-Dutch relations.

As a historian, my opinion is that you have to know the past, for otherwise you cannot act in a responsible way. My interest is in the background of present developments in our society. Peace and war is one problem area that we have to be able to handle; otherwise we will not survive in the end.

Haim Gordon (Beer-Sheva, Israel)

My real work in peace education began when somebody said to me: You are teaching about Martin Buber, but you are not trying to educate people to live according to the spirit of Buber. I said: That's a good idea. So I wrote up a proposal on what should be done. Some representatives from a foundation in Bavaria came to our university and promised money if somebody would give a good proposal. Then I took my proposal out of my drawer. The foundation liked it because Germany was interested in peace education, and especially a dialogue between Jews and Arabs. So they gave me a quarter of a million DM, and I was suddenly Cinderella.

I worked on that project for three years and I educated about 200 and something Jews and Arabs, to teach them to relate dialogically in the spirit of Buber. I connected them with Egyptian people too. That's how I got involved in peace education. Since then my main interest in peace education has been really more from the spiritual level, studying what philosophers have said related to this problem area. I haven't been working on peace education regularly; I have been doing philosophy and then I have come back to peace education from time to time.

ÅB: What about your present work?

HG: Right now I am not doing anything in peace education, but in the future I might because our new minister of education is a friend of mine. I might add that in my teaching I deal with education for democracy at times, which may be seen as a related field.

ÅB: Could you say a few more words about what this dialogue project with Arabs and Jews involved more concretely?

HG: Well, I developed the method described in my book "Dance, Dialogue, and Despair". What I did was first of all to teach people the philosophy of Martin Buber, and then to show them how it can be lived. It is difficult to say how well we succeeded – perhaps in 20 or 30 percent of the cases we arrived at a real learning of dialogue. We had two kinds of people in that project. We had university students from Ben Gurion University, maybe

about 60 % or a little more, but we always made sure that we had an additional group "from the street", a bus driver, a bank clerk, etc., people who were willing to take it just for the experience.

Magnus Haavelsrud (Tromsø, Norway)

When I was going to write a paper on pedagogy at the University of Oslo in 1965, I asked Eva Nordland if I could write about children's conceptions or war and peace. She sent me to Johan Galtung, and the upshot was my doing a study. The idea was to give a questionnaire to children in Berlin on either side of the wall, in the East and in the West. So I went there and got the permission to go ahead in West Berlin, but I was turned down in the East – the explanation was that in East Berlin all children are for peace, so there was no need to investigate it.

I had taken an interest in that area before that. I think it's associated with the experiences I had when I did my military service, when I was drafted as a soldier. I could never really come to terms with the fact that I was going in there to be trained to shoot and prepared to participate in war. But, unlike many others, I never turned pacifist, maybe because I come from an environment in our country where it wasn't customary to think along those lines – an agrarian environment, far from a city. Those were not things you talked about.

ÅB: Could you say something about what you have been doing later in connection with this problem area?

MH: I studied in the US and participated in The World Conference on Education in California in 1969, and there I met Betty Reardon, among others, in a working group. That was the beginning of The World Council for Cur- riculum and Instruction. The Foreign Department in Oslo paid for my trip, and it turned into an important contact for me and many other people. That meeting meant that I was accepted into Betty Reardon's School Program. I then worked with a course on child-rearing for peace for teachers in the US and Canada, and after that we helped to organize The World Conference on Education at the University of Keele in 1974, which was a follow-up to the California conference.

Since the network of educators working with these issues in the US and Canada was becoming increasingly international, it was organized as the "Peace Education Commission" within the "International Peace Research

Association". I was appointed executive secretary of that commission in 1975, and since then I haven't really been able to tear myself away from that type of work, because it has been so interesting.

ÅB: Are you involved at present in work within the area of peace education?

MH: Yes, I'm trying to write a historical survey. It's going to be some kind of history of science, about how the ideas of peace education arose, when they were presented and by whom, whether those ideas have survived and the foci of the discussions. I'm collaborating on this with an Italian called Mario Borrelli. We have got as far as the mid-sixties, so most of the work still remains. I think a work like that might be instructive, not only for me.

ÅB: When do you think this work will result in something that is available to the general reading public?

MH: We have put together a compendium of about 75 pages covering the period up to 1964, but I hope that something else will be available shortly.

ÅB: I know that you have been working on a teacher's handbook for UNESCO. How is that coming along?

MH: Yes, that is a handbook on Disarmament Education for Teachers. But it has turned into a complicated matter. The work has been going on at the same time as the US threatened to leave UNESCO and actually did so eventually. Among other things, the US disliked UNESCO addressing issues of disarmament. We had a manuscript in progress, but UNESCO never took a serious interest in making it possible for us to finish the work process. There is a manuscript at UNESCO, but it hasn't been completed and published, and I don't know if it will be published.

Ian M. Harris (Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA)

I am a 45-year old educator at the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee. I am employed in the School of Education and work in programs serving adults, people whose average age is 35, coming to college to complete an undergraduate degree. I started teaching a course called "Peace education" in 1983 in response to a group of faculty who got together at that time to raise issues about war and peace on my campus. We met on a monthly basis at a luncheon to try to figure out what our campus could do to promote greater awareness of the nuclear dilemma. After I had been meeting with them four or five times it occurred to me that I, a professor of the School

of Education, could offer a course called "Peace education".

I first taught that course in the fall of 1983, and it totally changed my life. Since that time I have become a Quaker, and reoriented my whole life towards peace education. At this point I am very deeply involved in peace issues. One of the things I now do to promote peace education is edit twice a year a publication, The University Peace Studies Newsletter, for the Consortium on Peace Research, Education, and Development.

Petra Hesse (Boston, Massachusetts, USA)

I think most recently I became interested in peace education because I have been teaching at a college that trains teachers, and I know that many teachers are very much concerned about conflicts and conflict resolution in their classrooms. I teach courses on political, social and emotional development. Somehow I think the content of the courses I teach and the concern of my students converge in my interest in children's social development, conflict resolution, and political development.

In America, many teachers are particularly interested in conflict resolution in their classrooms because of the deregulation of children's television in the early 1980s, which has led to a situation where there are no clear limits any more on the amount of violence that can be shown on this television.The incidents of violence have increased on many children's TV programs, and as a result teachers see a lot more war games in their classrooms. It's almost a socio-cultural phenomenon. When there is an increase in violence in the classrooms, teachers really feel a need to do something about it.

In terms of my more longstanding interest, the fact that I grew up in Germany, I think, means that I have carried with me a certain amount of guilt about the Holocaust. So there is a sort of long-standing interest in the prevention of war, in how to prevent stereotyping that easily leads to violence, eventually to the kind of violence that occurred during the Holocaust. So I think there has been some kind of sensitization that has been with me for a long period of time.

ÅB: How long were you in Germany?

PH: I lived in Germany for the first 22 years of my life, so I went through elementary and high school and three years of college there before I came to the States.

ÅB: Could you also tell me something about your present work?
PH: Currently I am an assistant professor of human development. At a very small college in Boston I am teaching courses not just of human development, but also on social psychology and clinical psychology. It's a teachers' training college. Then I am also a research associate at the Center for Psychological Studies in the Nuclear Age, which was founded a few years ago out of a concern about children's fears of the future and children's concerns about nuclear war.

To summarize the nature of my research work, I coordinate a research project on children's and adolescents' images of the enemy and have more recently become more interested in an integration of media literacy, multi-cultural and conflict resolution education. My work on children's television is a spin-off of my research on children's images of the enemy. I became interested in the images of the enemy on children's television, because many children told me that they get their ideas about good guys and bad guys from children's television.

David Hicks (Bath, England)

My name is David Hicks. Currently I'm running a curriculum project on alternative futures. But for most of the 1980s I was directly involved in promoting the term and the practice of peace education. I became interested in that field as a result of my post-graduate studies with Paul Smoker at the University of Lancaster, where I discovered peace research, in particular Galtung's writings. I was very impressed and was interested in how I could adapt that and use that with school teachers. Having been a teacher in school, I have then been working with teachers in primary and secondary school for a long time.

So for nine years, from 1980 to 1989, I ran a small unit, called the Center for Peace Studies which was based at a College of Education, called St. Martin's College in Lancaster. Although this was sometimes misconstrued as being something broader and dealing with all aspects of peace and conflict, it was actually meant to give service and support to school teachers.
ÅB: I know that you have been doing project work on World Studies. Could you tell me a little about that?

DH: My initial idea back in 1980 was to set up this unit called the Center for Peace Studies in order to run various projects. In reality I came to focus on one project which was called World Studies 8-13. "World Studies" was the term that got used in England – I guess the American term would be "global education". The label 8-13 refers to the age range. While I think there are some differences between world studies and peace education, I see them both involving a common process in the classroom. I think I spent much of the 80s trying to disentangle what the differences were, if any. I tended to say to teachers that world studies began from a concern about Spaceship Earth or global interdependence, while peace education began with a concern for violence, both direct and structural, but that in the end many of their concerns were overlapping and very similar.

ÅB: Could you also say a few words about your present project on alternative futures?

DH: This is a small curriculum project, in this case funded by the Worldwide Fund for Nature. (All my work over the last 12 or 13 years has depended on money from trusts and organizations!) I have always been interested in the concept of alternative futures, but I felt that this could do with much more high-lighting than it has received so far. Also my feeling was that in peace education or world studies teachers had often become very good at dealing with the problems – very good at helping young people to understand problems of peace and conflict, global issues, but that one of the results of that often was in fact to *dis*empower young people. They became depressed by learning more about the problems. I think in particular teaching about the nuclear issues brought me face to face with that. The more we help young people understand dilemmas of the earth, the arms race, nuclear winter and so on, the greater risk that they are depressed by the end of it. It seemed to me that one way to give a more empowering experience to young people is not to ignore problems, certainly not, but to also focus on: Where do we want to go? What sort of world do we want? This means to develop young people's and teachers' capacities to dream and have visions, but also having done that, to come back very much to the here and now and to say: What does that mean about what I'm going to be doing in my community, in my school, at home, in relation to my local world and the wider world?

ÅB: Would this project mean that you are developing some exercises and material for teachers that show them how they can do this?

DH: In all my work I see one outcome as being very practical, usable teach-

ing materials. The World Studies 8-13 project has produced two handbooks for teachers. The first one was called "World Studies 8-13", a teachers' handbook that has been fairly successful in the last five years. Later we produced "Making Global Connections". Part of both of those books contained immediately useful classroom activities. I was also involved in a book on education for peace which was slightly different in that it dealt with a wide range of issues – exploring issues having to do with peace, conflict, race, gender, futures and so on – having just one or two classroom activities at the end of each chapter. That book has not sold anyway near as well as the others!

Coming back to your question: Yes, with my current project – which is actually called the Global Futures Project – part of my commission is to produce, at the end of a three-year period, teaching materials, either for pupils or as resources for teachers. I imagine that I will probably do what I've done before, which is to aim it at teachers for fairly immediate use in the classroom.

Kathleen Kanet (New York, USA)

My name is Kathleen Kanet, I am a North-American and I am a member of a Roman Catholic Religious Congregation of Women, the Religious of the Sacred Heart of Mary. I began my professional career as a teacher, then I was an elementary school principal and then I worked with my own congregation which is an international congregation as director of education for its schools.

For the past 13 years I have been with an organization called The Intercommunity Center for Justice and Peace, which is a coalition of religious congregations of women and men. The mission of the Intercommunity Center is inspired by the gospel message and the social doctrine of the church which is to work for the establishment of peace and justice. My particular work has been in developing and promoting peace and justice education. I think I would be satisfied with the term peace education as long as it is defined to agree with Pope Paul VI when he said: There ean be no peace without justice. So, I believe justice is constitutive to peace.

During the past 13 years I, with colleagues in several groups and organizations have been asking the basic questions: What is peace education? How can we educate for our students to become participators in trans-

forming the world to be a just and peaceful place? I have been involved in developing educational materials: teacher education materials and in-service programs as well as educational programs from K through 12 through university, including adult education or non-formal education.

ÅB: Could you tell me a little about these materials and some of your ideas related to them?

KK: Yes. I have always been interested in learning and in education. Peace education is really quality education, it is for me constitutive to learning, a necessary element of education. In the 1970s I with four other women here in the New York area formed a group, the Justice/Peace Education Council. Part of our work was in peace and justice education, but we all worked for different organizations. We came together to ask ourselves: what really is peace education, what must we do to promote it, and how can we help schools and teachers to become peace educators? So we had to do some thinking and research on how humans develop, what are elements of peace education and how such a curriculum would look. We spent about a year doing this – we would meet monthly for a day, we had people come in and talk to us. We decided to develop lesson-plans where justice and peace concepts could be infused into the curriculum.

We had got this idea of infusion from a man who worked on a research project with a grant from the United States government asking similar questions as we. We knew that teachers did not want to have something added extra on. So whatever we introduced would have to be communicated as something that would be an enhancement and enrichment of the present program. A process of infusion means looking at a lesson plan – it can be any subject, any grade; it can be math, science, social studies etc. – and looking at what the aim of the lesson is, what you are currently teaching, what skills you are teaching, what knowledge you are trying to communicate, what kind of questions are asked. And then saying: Is there a relative peace or justice concept that could be added to this lesson and that is enriching it, making the lesson better and teaching a peace and justice concept.

We developed a one-day workshop for teachers. In the workshop we introduced people to a concept of change not only on the personal and inter-personal levels but also on the structural level. Then we introduced a body of knowledge which is 28 peace and justice concepts. Now, when we first sat down we said: What concepts should be taught and we brainstormed – we got, I think, about 72. Then we said: Well, that's too much to

ask teachers to consider, so we used the concept of human dignity as the umbrella concept and selected the concepts most important in this connection.

The third part of this program is teaching the lesson-planning technique. We assume that the teacher has an aim for the specific lesson, and we also assume that there is a preparation of an activity for the student. The infusion technique doesn't apply to somebody who teaches by giving a lecture. We then ask if one of our concepts could be used to enrich the lesson and would expand the lesson, the activity or change it in some say. For example, if you are teaching students, in a skill subject like math, how to develop a bar graph, you can infuse information that is meaningful from the point of view of peace and justice so that they are not making bar graphs about how many shoes there are in two stores, but about caloric intake in various countries.

We have now the fourth edition of the manual; because when the five members of Justice/Peace Education Council working on this started to give workshop always in teams, pretty soon it became obvious that there were not enough of us to give the workshops that were being asked of us. So we developed a three-day training seminar or leadership seminar preparing people to present workshops. In that process we developed the manual, so the manual is a step-by-step outline of each cycle of our workshop.

In these seminars, we are also raising questions about the structural dimension: What are for example the economic, political, social and cultural aspects that impinge upon – either enhance or deny – human dignity? Then we also link this to what the Senate of Bishops in Rome said 1971 (in the document "Justice in the World"): Action on behalf of justice, participation in the transformation of the world is constitutive to the preaching of the gospel. This means that if you are not acting to change these realities here, you are really not participating in the full message of the gospel. These actions, in turn, could be of different kinds: From a personal and interpersonal level we may look at the victim and practice the virtues of mercy, charity and compassion – this is the level of challenge to change unjust structures. Dom Helder Camara of Brazil has said: "If I feed the hungry, they call me a saint; if I ask why the hungry are hungry, they call me a communist." This means attending also to the structural level. So we have schemas on these approaches to help people to understand not that this structural level is more important, but that this level is often not well

understood by us and this represents a field where we have to be more active.

In 1983 working through the National Catholic Education Association, we developed a program called "Making a World of Difference in Catholic Schools" and we were able to offer these workshops around the United States. What we wanted to do is to set up a contract with the education departments in the Catholic school system. So we said: We would come and do a three-day workshop for 25 of your educational leaders and the contract included then that they would make every effort to make sure that every Catholic elementary or secondary school in their diocese would then be given one of these workshops over a 2-year period of time. We worked with over 50 dioceses. In all this work the five of us worked collaboratively, participated in the development equally and really utilized the talents of each one.

ÅB: Were all of you teachers?

KK: All of us were teachers. All of us had also been administrators, so we had a vast store of knowledge and experience behind us. Also we have published two books that we have written collaboratively, explaining our work: *Directions for Justice/Peace Education in the Catholic Elementary School* and *Dimensions of Justice and Peace in Religious Education.*

Søren Keldorff (Aalborg, Denmark)

I am a trained psychologist (1975) and have been teaching psychology and education at university level since then. I've also done research in these areas and written books about family psychology, educational psychology and the history of psychology. During the last five years I have increasingly oriented my teaching and research towards the psychology and pedagogics of peace, and I have succeeded in introducing elements of these areas into the first two years of the study of social sciences at the University of Aalborg. I have also taught these subjects in adult education evening classes.

In collaboration with Professor Pauli Jensen at the Danish School of Educational Studies in Copenhagen I have edited one of the first Danish books – an anthology – about peace education ("Peace Education – the Psychology and Pedagogics of Working for Peace". Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1984).

Finally I might mention that I have been working lately in a project associated with the new centre for peace and conflict research in Copen-

hagen. This is a project dealing with young people's and adults' perceptions of the relations between the East and the West and their fear of nuclear war.

ÅB: Could you say a little more about these studies? What is it in particular that you are interested in studying, and is it possible to say something about the result?

SK: There have been quite a number of studies that show that people worry a lot about the arms race of the superpowers and about nuclear war. As a matter of fact, WHO has pointed to this anxiety as being one of the greatest health risks of the 80s. My colleague Professor Pauli Jensen and some Danish doctors who are against nuclear weapons have made a Danish counterpart of the international Goldenring-Doctor investigation. The Danish study shows that more than 80% of some 1,200 schoolchildren studied in Copenhagen worry about nuclear war every day.

I myself have taken a slightly different direction in my research and teaching about peace. A couple of years ago, in Yugoslavia, I met some American Quakers and peace activists who taught me to work with "workshops of the future". The reason why I'm using this work method now – much more so than the lectures I used to go on tour with – is that, in my opinion, it's becoming increasingly essential to motivate people to act in a positive way with a more peaceful future in view. For when you lecture on all the gloomy prospects of the arms race and the danger of war, there's a risk that you might help people repress all those terrible things because they simply cannot stand thinking about them. By using the "workshops of the future", you take a different approach – pedagogically – and mobilise people's imagination and their desires for changes in the world.

ÅB: Can you explain briefly what this method involves?

SK: The technique is really quite simple. First you try to make the participants relax. Then you ask them to recall a particular situation in their childhood when they felt safe. Against that background they then visualize or imagine a peaceful society – 30 years into the future. When their conceptions of this peaceful society have become fairly clear, you ask them to "remember" how it was created. And then you have to go back from their conceptions to our current reality in order to conceive new ideas leading to concrete action.

ÅB: Do you think that your "workshops" function well?

SK: Yes. Surprisingly well, if I may say so myself. People have many creative ideas for a better future. And I think the most fantastic thing is that

there is no major age difference: 18-year-olds and pensioners are equally animated when it comes to creating conceptions of a different and better future – a future without violence, social injustice and militarism.

ÅB: Could you say something about what this imagined peaceful society usually looks like?

SK: In relation to today's society, there are changes in at least three dimensions. These three dimensions concern the relationships individual – work, individual – individual and individual – nature.

To put in very briefly: in the future that people envisage, the time frame for obligatory work has been drastically reduced. People often imagine small, selfgoverning units that are responsible for housing and their own production of necessities. Child rearing and child minding are taken care of locally, since there are always elderly people with plenty of time and experience who can look after the children – then, of course, there are the animals, who also play an important role in many of my informants' visions of the future. On the whole, there is great respect for everything that's alive. Naturally this also applies to the environment; people want to reestablish a natural and sensitive relationship with nature – an ecological co-existence and protection.

ÅB: Do you see any connection between the results of the "workshop method" and the studies about school children's anxiety that you mentioned earlier?

SK: Yes, definitely. The wide spectrum of worries about the future of the world that appeared in the studies of school children between 12 and 17 reemerges to a large extent among the young people and adults when they try to find solutions in the "workshops of the future": rearmament, danger of war, violence in everyday life, starvation in the world, unemployment, insecurity and alienation in the social network, etc.

In my opinion, what we are dealing with here is nothing less than a gigantic, latent need for a change of reality that neither the educational system nor the political parties seem to perceive or understand because it is so radical.

Herbert C. Kelman (Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA)

I have had a very long career in conflict resolution, particularly the social-psychological aspects of war and peace and international relations more

generally. I have not really been directly involved in peace education as it relates to the general public or to the school system. Whatever I have been involved in, as far as education is concerned, has been at the university level.

At that level, I was involved in a small program that we had here at Harvard. It was called the "International Studies Program", but it was basically a peace and conflict analysis program. For a number of years, that program offered a course called "Problems of Peace, Justice, and the Processes of Change". I was one of the people involved in planning the course and I participated in teaching it. This has been my involvement at the undergraduate level. Of course, at the graduate level I have been teaching for many years a seminar on social-psychological approaches to international relations and international conflict.

I have also been involved from its very beginning in the field of peace research. My involvement in peace research goes back to the early 1950s. Back in 1952, I was part of a group of mostly young social scientists who started the Research Exchange on the Prevention of War, the purpose of which was to look at ways in which social science knowledge and methods from different fields could be applied to the study of war and peace. Among other activities, we published the *Bulletin of the Research Exchange on the Prevention of War*, which was the forerunner of the *Journal of Conflict Resolution*.

ÅB: Where was this activity located?

HK: Its headquarters towards the end was at the University of Michigan. Then the *Journal of Conflict Resolution* took over the publication activities of the Research Exchange; and the other activities were mostly taken over by a committee of SPSSI, The Society for the Psychological Studies of Social Issues. I have been active in that organization for many, many years. I edited the book on *International Behavior* (which appeared in 1969) for the Society. So I guess I would describe my involvement as one in peace research and peace education at the university level, although obviously it has implications for peace education at other levels.

Another thing that I might point to here is the practical work that I am doing on conflict resolution: third party intervention in ongoing conflict situations such as in the Middle East. I have also done some work on the Cyprus conflict. Some of my students are interested in other conflict areas, for example, Northern Ireland or South Africa.

ÅB: Could you say something about the method or approach in this work?

HK: The approach is what I call "Interactive Problem Solving". Basically what it involves is bringing together politically influential representatives of parties in conflict for direct interaction in a private setting under completely unofficial auspices (in my own work it is generally under academical auspices) – bringing them together for direct communication around the conflict. The hope is that through this kind of interaction, which is guided by a third party of social scientists, the parties will gain new understanding of the conflict and be able to look at the conflict as a problem that they have in common and that they have to work on jointly in order to find creative resolutions. So basically the purpose of the workshops is to create an opportunity for the parties to share their mutual perspectives, to come away with a new understanding of their own concerns, the other's concerns, and the conflict in general, and – as a result of this – to come up with new ideas for conflict resolution.

The purpose is not *just* that, but it is also to find ways in which these new ideas and these new understandings can then be fed into the political process. When I talk about this work, I always say that workshops and related activities have a dual purpose: educational and political. The educational purpose is an integral part of the whole enterprise. By "educational" in this context I mean very simply that it provides an opportunity for the parties to learn something new – about their own priorities, about the other party, about the conflict – and to develop new ideas about conflict resolution. In this sense it is an approach addressed to the specific individuals who participate.

The second purpose is political. From my point of view it is not enough just to create an educational opportunity for the individuals involved, but it is also necessary to give that opportunity a political significance. This purpose affects how I select participants and how we follow up on workshops; the concern is with feeding back what is learnt into the political process – either by communications to political leaders or by getting these ideas into the political debate within each society involved.

So the educational and the political purposes are intertwined here; the emphasis depends on the level of the participants. I am always looking for people who are politically involved, at least people whom one might call "pre-influentials". But when I am dealing with people who are younger, less influential, less politically involved, the educational purpose is the primary purpose, because the political influence is then something potential, in the future. When dealing with people who *are* politically influential,

political actors, then, of course, the political purpose may be the predominant one.

So there is always both a political purpose and an educational purpose. In that sense I would say that my conflict resolution work really is a form of peace education, if you will, directed not so much to the larger public as it is to political influentials or pre-influentials.

I might also add that this work and other work that I have done over the years in pursuit of my interest in international conflict, such as analyses of the role of perceptions and images in conflict, the role of nationalism and political ideology, the nature of decision-making processes – all of the kinds of issues to which I as a social psychologist have tried to address myself – can be seen as part of a process of peace education in the larger sense of the term, in the sense of creating new ideas.

For instance, one of my strong convictions is that we need to redefine the concept of security. What has happened is that security has been largely appropriated by the military. There is a tendency now to equate security with military hardware and military strategy, which I think is a distortion. Although I have strong antimilitarist convictions, I can accept that there are different views about this. I can accept that for many people the military does play an important role in security. But still it is only a means, it is not an end. I think that we have gotten into a situation where military force build-up contributes much more to insecurity than it does to security, and the military emphasis has been to make security into a zero-sum rather than a positive-sum commodity. I believe that, even from a military point of view, each side's own security is increased if the other side's security is increased; whereas we have been accustomed to think the other way: that the more military strength we have and the less they have, the better off we are.

What I am saying is just an example. I feel that the concept of national and international security and the concept of defense have to be reformulated. This is a large part of what I see as the job of peace education. I like to believe that the kind of thinking that I am doing along with many of my colleagues is a contribution to this educational effort. We contribute by developing the ideas and concepts necessary for new thinking about these problems.

It might also be appropriate to bring in here some of my other work, related to "crimes of obedience". A book by that title (co-authored with V. Lee Hamilton and published by Yale University Press) deals with questions

like these: How do people react to superior orders? How do they relate themselves to authority? This work focuses on the question of personal responsibility for actions taken under superior orders – personal responsibility in the individual's relationship to authority. Some of the issues that I am concerned with here can be formulated in terms of education: How do you foster a readiness and a capacity for taking personal responsibility, not only for one's own actions but also for public policy? This is a broader issue, but it seems to me it is a particularly important one when it comes to questions of war and peace. This is an area in which traditionally citizens have left matters to the authorities. Questions of military policy and of foreign policy are among those issues that individuals by and large feel are beyond them, that they have to leave to the authorities.

If we are going to get a reformulation of the issues of security and the issues of war and peace more generally, I think we will have to create a citizenry that is more prepared to take personal responsibility for public actions. So in that sense I see the questions that we are addressing in this work on authority and responsibility as having relevance to peace education. Among the questions we are struggling with is: What are the kinds of experiences that children must have in order to be more inclined to take personal responsibility and more capable of doing so?

One of the requirements is obviously a sense of personal efficacy, and that depends on having some degree of authority in certain areas of your life. Empowerment experiences contribute to having a sense of personal efficacy, so people are not inclined to say: Well, there is nothing I can do about it; I don't know what is required. This is one element.

Another element, which is more difficult to put your finger on, is a need to demystify authority, to reduce the awe people have of authority, so that they are better able to question authoritative actions and better able to apply independent judgement. I am not against authority; I believe that all societies need authority in order to function effectively and in order to function equitably. But the *danger* that I see is an unquestioning attitude towards authority. We need to deal with this also in the home and in our social and political institutions, but I think a very important arena is the school system. There we need to develop this capacity and willingness to question authoritative pronouncements and judgements, which as I said also implies a certain demystification of authority.

One of the greatest dangers that I see is that so many things are accepted totally without question. To come back again to the example I gave before

about the definition of the term security in entirely military terms: it is just accepted as a fact although it does not make sense, because security is a psychological concept. Yet in most people's thinking it has become synonymous with military force. I think that even opening up the questions of "What is security?" and "How do you achieve security?" – in a sense making people conscious of the relationship between the action and the purpose that it is supposed to fulfill – is an important contribution.

Alberto L'Abate (Florence, Italy)

For thirty years I have been a member of the non-violent movement in Italy. I participated in the foundation of it. We felt that it would be very important to start training people in non-violence, so in 1981 we opened a summer school for non-violence in San Gimignano near Florence, where we, each summer, hold seminars on non-violence, also with participants from other countries. We introduced training connected to action. So this was my first start in the peace area outside of the school and the university.

But later I thought that I could also do something in the school, in my courses in the university. I teach methodology in social research. I thought that it could be nice to introduce peace issues also to my students, especially because many of my students come from pedagogy and later become teachers. So I started a seminar on research for peace. Many of the students were interested and attended this seminar. We use several ways of doing research. This is one of the fields I am interested in: to see how research can be used to educate for peace.

ÅB: Could you say something about the kind of research that you work with in this context?

AL: We use several systems or models of research for this purpose. One method used is *questionnaires*. In one study we collected answers from about 5 000 students. We studied their attitudes to peace, their information about peace and their behaviour related to peace. They usually have very little information. We try to understand how these interact: information, attitude and behaviour. For example, we have used path analysis to see how these are interconnected. We could see that peace education in school did succeed in giving to the students a desire to research more actively in this field. This research brings more information and this increased information leads to a more non-violent attitude and this non-violent attitude results in

more participation. It is often said that there is no knowledge about the results of peace education. I think that my studies show that peace education can have positive effects both on attitudes and behaviour.

The second model we have used was a composition analysis, a *content analysis of essays written by the students*. The theme "What does the word peace mean to you?" was given. The essays were then subjected to analysis with both qualitative and quantitative techniques, because we think they are complementary. We used this method at different levels of school, from elementary to middle high school and superior high school. We see quite clearly that the younger students were more likely to search for a peaceful solution to conflicts and less inclined to accept war and violence. This means that the traditional school, instead of preparing for peace, is preparing for acceptance of the system that has existed. School makes them feel unable to change things. However, bringing the results of this research into the class, letting the students discuss the results was very interesting. It is useful for the students to see that there are different opinions. In that way, research can be an instrument for change.

This method can also be very helpful for changing teacher behaviour in relation to composition. They usually just read the text and say: it is nice, it is written well, or written badly, which is often a very subjective judgement. The content analysis method, on the other hand, gives terribly rich material.

The third method used in our work is *experimentation with cooperative games* in kindergarten and elementary school. This was made with students who were teachers at these levels.They were helped by some of the students of our group who did not teach, who went with them into the classes and assisted them in observing what happened in the classroom process and what was coming out as a result. For example, we could see that the cooperative games did open groups that were closed, whereas groups using competitive games tended to close the groups. When I say "open groups", I mean that the students tend to involve others, try to create a communication with the others, to create a sense of community in the class. On the contrary, the competitive games led to polarization of conflict. In addition, the cooperative games had a positive influence on assertive behaviour, while diminishing aggressive and passive behaviour. So cooperative games are important in peace education.

The fourth method of research was used with students from the teacher training in Florence and involved *analysis of historical cases*, cases from

The Philippines, China, Israel-Palestina and Italy. In all cases we studied examples of violent and non-violent struggles to see how they worked, whether non-violent behavior increased or diminished the conflict. We could see that the non-violent struggle tended to eliminate the enemy because it creates friends among the enemies, and so it increases the possibilities of finding solutions to problems. On the contrary, violence tends to strengthen the enemy. I think it is important to demonstrate in a scientific way what Gandhi tried to say and to do, when he told us: I do not want to kill my adversary, I want to convert him. In our four cases we could see that it did work like that: non-violence did create sympathy among prior enemies who became your allies, thus changing the situation. Although this fourth method in my work was used among university students, I think it can be used also in high school, for example, when you study history, and it can also be used in training people outside school.

Linda Lantieri (New York, USA)

My position is now with the New York City Central Board of Education. I am currently the Peace Education Coordinator at the N.Y.C. Central Board of Education and Co-Director of the *Resolving Conflict Creatively Program*. I started off as a classroom teacher, was an assistant principal, director of an alternative junior high school in East Harlem, taught at the university level for five years, and for the last ten or so years I've been doing special projects in relation to curriculum development in the New York City Public Schools. New York City is the largest urban school district in the country; we serve one million children.

We began to take an interest in the field of peace education about four years ago when our division sponsored a conference on nuclear issues, what children were facing growing up in the nuclear age. I was one of the workshop leaders at that conference, and the Executive Director of Educators for Social Responsibility, Tom Roderick did a workshop also. At my workshop I talked about some of the research in the field, especially in the USA, related to children's fears of nuclear holocaust, how some of these fears are evident in their drawings. I also talked about the level of violence we are experiencing in our everyday lives. As an outcome of this conference, one particular school district – School District 15 in Brooklyn – decided to invite some of the workshop leaders to their district because

they wanted to start teaching about issues of peace and conflict resolution in their schools. Some of the key people at this conference – Tom Roderick, who is the executive director of the Educators for Social Responsibility, myself, local school board people in that district and the superintendent – were involved from the start. ESR – the Educators for Social Responsibility – at that time was involved in small ways in terms of individual classes in the city, but never had they been asked to help develop an entire program for a school system. It was very exciting for them and for the Board of Education of N.Y.C. to receive this challenge.

Max Lawson (Armidale, New South Wales, Australia)

I am a senior lecturer in Education at the University of New England, Armidale, New South Wales, Australia. I was a high school teacher of English and History for 11 years. Then I was a lecturer in English at Sydney Teachers College, and for the past 14 years I have been at the University of New England, where I have taught history of education and educational theory. For the last four years I have also been teaching a course in peace education which I was able to establish. There are a whole sequence of courses that lead up to a major in peace studies at our university.
ÅB: Could you say a few words about this major in peace studies?
ML: The basic course for students is in the Geography department and it deals with the geography of peace and conflict. Students would progress from that course to my course in peace education which deals with inner peace, interpersonal peace and opens up the area of peace in the world. From there students take courses with a colleague of mine on education and development issues with a strong emphasis on peace and social justice themes.

Various other departments in the university offer courses with a peace emphasis, for example, the Economic History department has standard courses on the economy of Soviet Russia and the United States; for students with a peace studies emphasis, they would simply adapt the course, so that a major component of their assignments would deal with military expenditure, history of the arms race in these countries and related issues.

The History department offers a course on the age of Gandhi. Some students may do their major work on aspects of British policy. Students interested in peace studies then might do a major piece of work on the theory

and practice of non-violence.

ÅB: Can you say a few words on the development of your own interest in the field of peace education?

ML: My own interest in peace as such dates from the Vietnam war days. Australia sent conscripts to Vietnam, an issue that bitterly divided our country. Peace education as such, like elsewhere in the world, did not really develop in Australia until the early 1980s. The international year of peace was enthusiastically supported by the Australian government and that helped a lot in the promotion of ideas about peace education. In fact, a number of State Departments of Education appointed special consultants. Victoria, in particular, has been a state granting considerable financial support for peace education. In my own state, the New South Wales Teachers Federation put out a substantial manual which reached a great number of the teachers in the New South Wales state system.

Stig Lindholm (Copenhagen, Denmark; Sweden)

That is a long story, dating back to the mid-60s. I think I started to work with peace research in 1966. At that time I also directed an interdisciplinary series of seminars, a general intellectual playground, with writers, journalists and researchers. In those days there was more money, so you could easily invite guest lecturers. Then, towards the end of the 60s, I gradually started to work with issues concerning the developing countries and, in the early 70s, "development education". As you know, my doctoral dissertation, presented in 1970, dealt with opinions about developing countries. In this period, in 1973 to be more exact, I also made a trip to Latin America connected with "development education". After that, there was a period when I mainly devoted myself for several years to scientific theory and the fragmentation of knowledge.

Then I tried to connect the three main directions of my research – peace, development and the issues of knowledge – and that is when I took up the theme I call "a pedagogy for development and peace".

ÅB: Have you personally been involved in the issues of peace apart from in your research?

SL: Not very much. I am a member of Researchers against Nuclear Weapons, I go on lecture tours now and then, and I have had an interdisciplinary series of seminars. That is a forum where researchers as well as

peace activists can meet.

ÅB: When you started to do peace research in the 60s, was there a group working with those questions or were you working on your own?

SL: There was a small group of us. In those days there were sixty-point, or third-term, students who could write good, solid papers, and we published some of those. The first one was called "Peace Research from a Psychological Point of View" – it was written by three students, and it was quite good. We also discussed how the developing countries were treated in teaching materials and similar matters.

ÅB: Could you say something brief about your work in this field during the last few years?

SL: For one thing, I have had a couple of C1 (third term) students who have interviewed doctors and engineers who are against nuclear weapons. Then Toni Lindfors has compiled a report of a questionnaire sent to school administrators in upper secondary schools all over the country.

I myself have written a report about how 1,000 upper-secondary school students look at peace education (available in Swedish and English), and I have also tried to apply Jungian approaches to peace questions and the influencing of public opinion in a paper about the murder of Olof Palme and the collective subconscious. Now I would like to develop the theoretical perspectives in peace and quiet. The majority of the work on peace and development is being done within the disciplines of sociology, economics and political science. Macro-thinking is predominant. The psychological perspective needs to be developed more. As far as I remember, I have never come across such concepts as "the collective subconscious" in the contexts of peace research and development research. I think that such concepts are needed as a complement to the others, and I would like to devote myself to studying what can be made of them.

Mildred Masheder (London, England)

I have been interested in what one might call peace education for many years, but I would rather call my interest area development education, including first the foundations for good upbringing and finally for good citizenship. When I was teaching I was very much aware of the importance of relationships. I was teaching mostly in elementary schools at the primary level and also to some extent in secondary schools. (Primary for us is five

years old to eleven years old.)

Besides teaching for quite a long time I have also been doing research on the general subject of good education. We were very anxious to challenge the idea of the 11+ examination, that is, the fact that some children were separated from the others at the age of eleven in order to go to schools for the elite. We did a campaign on that. I think the comprehensive school is much more fair to everyone and gives children a better chance of developing.

Then I went into teacher education for the last twenty-odd years dealing with child development. I had the opportunity to specialize in multi-cultural education. People in Britain often didn't understand what was happening in the schools with children from many backgrounds. From there it was a short step to global education. Now that wasn't especially agreed to by the authorities in education. When I tried to get global education on to the syllabus that was refused by the CNAA, which is our degree-awarding body. – There was a lot of global education included in multicultural education, however.

Some years ago I got a grant from Rowntrees to do a study on co-operation, peace and conflict solving with young children. I dealt with the ages from three to eleven. After three years I produced this book, "Let us cooperate", which is selling remarkably well and has been translated for other countries too. It's a very simple book, although it's giving my basic philosophy of education and is presenting various classroom activities. Perhaps I am starting a new book directed towards parents on the same sort of theme.

ÅB: Can you say just briefly something more about the project work behind your book?

MM: I am the regional representative in Europe for The World Council of Curriculum and Instruction (WCCI) that among other things is working in favour of education for peace and social justice. Through that organization I got contacts with many people, and this enabled me to try out and get opinions on various activities in many different countries – mostly via teachers and also via some parents. – After the book was published, I went to a number of workshops with this material, including workshops in Japan, and I feel that it has been a success. Now it's a question of promoting the sales and possibly getting another publisher, a more widely known one, to take over the distribution.

Gerald F. Mische (New York, USA)

I am president and co-founder of the "Global Education Associates" which was founded in 1973. It evolved from development experiences in the Third World. I worked in Central America in socio-economic projects back in 1955-57 and then was co-founder of a nonprofit group called "The Association for International Development". This group for the next 10 years trained and sent people to 22 countries, working together with university programs.

I met my wife Pat in 1960 on my way to Africa. She was teaching for several years a teacher training program . When she came back in 1964 we were married and we worked together three more years with the Association for International Development. About 1967 we began to evaluate the whole development effort. We began to realize that what people do on a local level to obtain the control over their lives was increasingly impacted upon by new global forces; we began to see that it wasn't just a question of balancing between the national level and the local level. We began to see that history really had been moving to a different stage, that the traditional principles of sovereignty of territory were breaking down, and unless we began to look at international strategies and international institutions to cope with the new global economic monetary forces, efforts at the local scene would not succeed. So we resigned from this group to do postgraduate studies on global interdependence: I at Columbia University's School of International Affairs; Pat in Columbia University's Teachers College.

It was out of that experience that we co-founded together, Pat and I, this present group Global Education Associates back in 1973. One of the realities that we were looking at was the broader concept of security than just military security. Dealing with peace, we realize that there are different positions. Some people consider peace to be a very broad concept and see development and justice as components under that. We look at it the other way. We are talking about education for an interdependent world and hold that security today cannot just be seen in terms of military threats, but we see security in terms of military, economic, and environmental security.

We have associates in about 80 countries around the world that are looking at interdependence and at what we call world order alternatives. We need to *redefine security* and *national sovereignty* in the contexts of global interdependence. While realizing that the national state will remain still the major vehicle for much basic planning and problem solving, for

many problems it's now too small and for other problems it's too big. It's in that context of redefining security and sovereignty that we are working, and we look at the alternatives in terms of imaging the future, not merely responding to short term crises, which is the way that most nations and most people are looking at it. We have to look at long-range or intermediate-range world processes, focusing also on values. One value would be peace (absence of war, war prevention, disarmament). Other central values would be economic justice, ecological balance, participatory decision-making.

We understand that this can not be done merely by so-called Western-European or North-American prospectors, that beside the European and North-American prospectors we need African, Latin-American and Asian prospectors – *for two reasons*. One is that the rest of the world won't accept so-called Western models only. But secondly, we need the insights and experiences of people from different parts of the world; Western perceptions represent only one perspective. Therefore we have gone out to develop a certain global network of individuals and institutions around the world who are collaborating in this task of redefining sovereignty and security. A good bit of our work has been with educators.

ÅB: Could you give some concrete examples of what you are presently doing in your work within this network?

GM: We produce informational and educational materials. We have a quarterly publication called "Breakthrough". And we conduct a lot of conferences and seminars. The core analysis for much of our work is contained in a book that Pat and I wrote about 10 years ago, called "Toward a Human World Order". We talk about the national security straightjacket. All nations today are becoming in various ways national security states, mobilised not so much for basic human needs and the human and ecological agenda, but to compete on an enormous lawless global arena.

ÅB: Have you also worked with materials directly for schools?

GM: We have conducted many institutes around the world for teacher education.

ÅB: How are these operations financed?

GM: This is a non-profit group. We receive individual contributions, look for some small grants from foundations, church groups etc.

ÅB: Is your group affiliated to any religious organization? I am asking because of your location here in the Inter-Church Center.

GM: No, there is no such affiliation. However, we work a lot with faith-

related networks around the world. They have unique global networks that transcend national, cultural and ideological boundaries. And many of them are increasingly looking at problems of justice and peace, looking at the environmental problems, looking at human needs.

Valentina Mitina (Moscow, Russia)

I am a researcher, working in the field of comparative education, and one of the aspects of comparative education, as I see it, is peace education. I have been interested in the problem for more than 20 years. I have been teaching in elementary and secondary schools and have been involved in activities related to international education. In my school, we organized an international club, a club for international friendship, and the activities of the class were very wide and the students were very interested in this. Even now that these students are grown-up people, they still remember these old activities. So that was how I got started.

ÅB: I know that you are involved now in a project related to Eva Nordland's work. Could you say a few words about that?

VM: Our project was started in February 1988, and the idea was to make a research study – independent and parallel research – on the theme of responsibility, care and other aspects of peace education. Later on, environmental education was also included.

Perhaps you have read the book "Breakthrough". We would like to do something similar. We hope to bring together ideas from American, Soviet and Norwegian people, illustrating approaches to such things as human rights, ecological education, social responsibility, cooperative education and how to work with these themes at different levels of the school. There will be a collection of papers as a result of our cooperative work.

Robert Muller (Escazu, Costa Rica; New York, USA)

During the Second World War I have seen incredible sufferings in the conflict between France and Germany. My family in Alsace-Lorraine was always divided between the two countries. This is what determined me to work for peace. How this all happened is a long story, which I have extensively written about in some of my books. You will find there most of

the elements of the story of my life.

The starting point was that as a child I thought that to be alive was something absolutely marvellous, something divine, "göttlich". However, this attitude towards life was soon destroyed by national antagonisms between the French and the Germans, two evacuations of our home town, a war, horror scenes in the French underground – to the point that when the war was over, I decided to work for peace instead of becoming a medical doctor or a hat-maker as my father wished me to be.

I joined the service of the United Nations in 1948 as a result of an essay on world government – and I remained there ever since, for 40 years. I had a long and interesting career in many positions. I know the United Nations inside out, and as one of its oldest officials, I am a kind of living encyclopedia of the UN history! I have worked with several Secretaries General, and when I recently had to retire, I decided to continue to be at the service of the UN as a one-dollar a year consultant to the Secretary General and as a one-dollar a year Chancellor of the University for Peace in Costa Rica.

That university is still at its beginning. The Rector is from Finland. My main functions are to promote the university in the United States and in Europe, to try to get funds and support for it, and to develop the creation of peace chairs, peace faculties and peace centers in as many universities as possible. We live most of the year near New York, close to the United Nations where I still have an office.

When I look at the present stage of my life, it appears that education is the main stream of my interest: Education about the United Nations which is almost unexisting in schools; education through the University for peace; and education through the Robert Muller school which was created in Arlington, Texas, on the basis of a world core curriculum which I designed a few years ago at the request of non-governmental organizations in the field of education.

I was really pushed into the field of education by educators represented at the UN who prodded me with the question: "What do you think about global education?" I wrote an essay, "The Need for Global Education", which was translated into several languages, published by Unesco, and distributed in many educational magazines around the world. (The essay is reproduced in my book "New Genesis"; Doubleday, New York.) After that they turned again to me and said: "We are now convinced about the need for global education, could you please tell us *what* you would exactly teach

in the schools?" This was the origin of the World Core Curriculum which is a universal framework of the knowledge humanity has arrived at, and which I would like to see taught in all schools of the world. It can be ordered as well as all my books from the Robert Muller School (6005 Royal Oak Drive, Arlington, Texas 76016).

ÅB: The idea of a "World Core Curriculum" is fascinating. Could you tell me a little more about its structure or content?

RM: It is very simple: 1) you give the child a good picture of the home into which he or she is born: the universe and in it our planetary home with all its wondrous aspects, down to the atom and the infinitely small; 2) you give the child a good picture of the family into which he is born, namely the human family with its great variety of natural and man-made common features and infinite diversities; 3) you give the child a good picture of the time flow into which he is born, from paleonthology, archeology and history to futurology; 4) you show the child his important, personal, miraculous entity in this wondrous Creation, with his physical, mental, sentimental and spiritual qualities, his agrandizement by all the knowledge acquired by humanity, and the role he or she can play to further humanity's progress during their short life on Earth. You teach them the art of a happy, peaceful, contributing living.

I have always been impressed by a statement often made by U Thant – the former Buddist Secretary General of the UN, for whom I had a great love and admiration: in his view the present generation would not be able to bring about peace on this planet and our only hope was through a new generation educated in a different way. He had been a teacher in his country of origin, Burma. As I am getting older, my belief in the role of a new education is increasing year after year. Like U Thant I believe that we will not get out of the present mess if human beings continue to be programed so exclusively into nationalism to the point of hating others and making war on other human beings.

You can of course imagine that the fact of being educated first by the French and then reprogramed by the Germans was an unforgettable experience for me, especially when you are told to hate the other side by which you just finished to be educated! I am grateful that I was later reprogramed by the UN which reeducated me rightly about our planetary home and our human family, putting the Earth and the human family as the priorities which need love and education in our age.

We need a fundamental revolution in education. We must prepare our

children correctly for the world in which they will live. What most of us believe today in terms of nationalism and of ideologies is obsolete. This must be replaced by a new education of people towards world citizenship, because henceforce the whole story of humanity will be the search for right relations between the human species and this planet and of right relations between human groups. Earlier frameworks of education are mostly wrong, because they didn't have to pay much attention to the fate of the planet and of the human species. But these today have become our priorities, and therefore there must be a new paradigm, a basic change in values and in education. The sooner it will happen, the better it will be. The entire future of this planet may depend on it.

Eva Nordland (Oslo, Norway)

My name is Eva Nordland, I'm Professor of Education at Oslo University, and I've participated in developing a new subject area that we call social pedagogy. It was created in cooperation with students as a protest against traditional pedagogy, which we experienced as being far too cause-and-effect-oriented as well as too competition-oriented. We built up something that was intended to be more geared to the complicated, interrelated community, and where people would learn to function in groups, learn to work on solving problems, use theory as a means of solving problems and practice as a means of reflecting on what they themselves saw. It has worked for 16-17 years now, and we're continuing to expand and refine it. That takes second place in my life in relation to number one, which is to be part of a family: I have a husband and four children.

I can't mention a date when I started to take an interest in peace work. To me, it has long been connected with the concept of democracy. I'm not as interested in how democratic political systems are designed as I am in the values on which they are based – in other words, how they handle equality, solidarity and responsibility. Those are the three key words that I associate with the word "democracy" and that I would like to see as fundamental to how I raise my own children as well as to my pedagogy, my professional life.

When I felt that it was difficult to find room for those ideas in the traditional work as it developed at Oslo University, I applied for a job in Denmark and was offered a chair in psychology in Århus. But then a possi-

bility to arrange parallel studies at Oslo University opened up, and since the family didn't want to move to Denmark I had to quit in Århus and start the activities that were to develop into social pedagogy in Oslo. And I've been working with that for almost 20 years now.

ÅB: Perhaps you could also say something about your current work in the area of peace education?

EN: In the last few years, peace organizations and environmental groups in Norway have begun to cooperate in what we call the Campaign for the Environment and Development, which comprises 76 organizations. The other thing that has happened in Norway and in the Nordic countries and that is important to me is the creation of the Alternative Future Project. It is most vital in Norway, but it is a Nordic project initiated by 17 organizations. The aim of the project is to work out ideas and models of, and knowledge about, how alternatives to the existing society can be developed. It's interesting that the pillar of the established society, i.e. Parliament, is sup- porting us in developing an alternative to the established society; we've been receiving approximately NKr 4 million a year.

In the process of that work, the concept of peace has widened considerably, for me and for other people. It comprises environmental development, solidarity work, human rights and, of course, disarmament. The issues of environmental protection are absolutely central. The concept of peace has expanded so as to encompass a totally alternative social development. Part of our work is founded on an analysis of the values relevant to society in the future; social values should be given priority over material and economic development, and great importance is attached to social, human values, i.e. equality and justice in a global context. It's remarkable to see what a high degree of consensus there is about these matters. One tends to think, occasionally, that this is something I personally have developed for myself in my life, and then one discovers that practically everybody involved shares one's views. That gives an inner conviction that we are on our way.

In this kind of work it's important to make room for hope, hope linked to activity. What's stopping us from sitting down and simply describing all those varying and positive things that exist, rather than make statistics of all the terrible and disastrous things? We need that *too*, of course, but it's important that we don't just content ourselves with research documenting misery. I'm involved in a project that we call "Participants", where we try to describe generations as participants in their own shared local environ-

ment.

In my peace work it's been important for me, among other things, to establish contacts with the Soviet Union, since it has somehow been described as our "main enemy" for quite some time now. When I took part in the peace march from Stockholm to Minsk, I made friends with many people and felt that we were "of the same kind", had the same hopes, the same convictions, the same morals, which, as a matter of fact, I knew beforehand, since I've had many previous contacts.

On a subsequent occasion, when I was in the Soviet Union to give a lecture at the University of Moscow, the Deputy Minister of the Department of Education was my hostess, and it turned out that she and I walked hand in hand in the peace march in Moscow in 1982. We became friends, and when I met her again at a women's conference, I suggested that we should initiate parallel research where we would chart and describe the positive things that happened, so that we would be able to meet and share our experiences. Very little red tape was required, since we agreed on making such economic arrangements that the issues of currencies did not present a problem. She had two requests: on the one hand, that our first meeting should take place in Oslo and, on the other, that I should use my contacts in the United States, so that people in the USA would also be involved in our project. It was easy to meet both of those requests, and then we went ahead. The American participants were Betty Reardon and her colleagues at the Teachers College in New York. We have now developed a close, personal teamwork.

Mitsuo Okamoto (Hiroshima, Japan)

My name is Mitsuo Okamoto, and I come from Japan. I teach at Hiroshima Shudo University. At the moment I am president of the Peace Association of Japan, which has over 700 members. We will be the host organization of the IPRA Conference in 1992.

I have been engaged in so-called Peace Studies instruction for the last 17 years or so. This was the first formal peace studies course in Japan, created in 1976, but I was teaching in this area even before the establishment of this formal course. Three years ago this was developed into an international peace studies course utilizing five faculty members. This was at my former university, Shikoku Gakuin University. Since April, 1990 I have been at

Hiroshima Shudo University, where I am also professor of peace studies. A new peace studies course was set up there this year in the Department of International and Political Science. So I have been teaching peace studies to university students for the last 16 or 17 years.

Priscilla Prutzman (Nyack, New York, USA)

I am the program coordinator of CCRC ("Children's Creative Response to Conflict") and also co-founder. I became interested in conflict resolution out of an interest in non-violence and the civil rights movement in the 60s. I went to Selma, Alabama and was a volunteer in the civil rights movement when I was in high school. I met Quakers there, and I became a non-violence trainer in a Quaker Project on Community Conflicts (QPCC) in New York City. Out of that experience grew the CCRC-program which really has grown quite a bit since then.

We haven't used the word peace education as much as conflict resolution, except in peace groups, because we have had the goal of getting into the public schools right from the beginning. We use the term conflict resolution rather than peace education. In fact, up until maybe eight or nine years ago, peace education in this country was considered not a very good term. However, recently I think peace education as a term is more acceptable and I certainly don't feel any problem to use the word peace education now, at all.

ÅB: You see what you are doing as part of peace education?

PP: Yes, definitely. I think peace educators consider our work to belong to their field too. Not only because of our Quaker roots, but because we have been in the peace movement, we grew out of it. Our original goal was really to get into the main stream educational system, and we have accomplished that.

ÅB: You see CCRC as growing out of Quaker roots?

PP: Yes. Our philosophy is very much rooted in the Quaker philosophy.

ÅB: But would you also say that since that these are the roots, persons who are not Quakers would not be able to use your materials?

PP: No. Quakers tend to be very open and reach out to a lot of different groups. We have had a tremendous amount of support from Catholic peace educators as well as from many different Protestant religions. We work

with Ethical Humanists, we work with Jewish groups – with all kinds of groups.

Hanns-Fred Rathenow (Berlin, Germany)

I am a member of the Department of Education at the Technical University of Berlin, working in the field of methodology of social studies. My interest in peace education may be traced back to the philosophical, ethical and religious background of my Protestant upbringing. I also want to mention my experiences as a student at a College of Higher Education (Pädagogische Hochschule), a college devoted to teacher training. Here I learnt the methods as well as the philosophical, sociological and psychological backgrounds of the so-called German "Reformpädagogik" (the "New Education" of England, the "Progressive Education" of the United States), an educational reform movement from the beginning of the century, and even earlier. Within this area of education you will find several approaches similar to those we are now discussing under the term Peace Education. This tree of education is reproducing itself because education for peace and international understanding did belong to some of the works of educationalists in this period.

My own work in peace education, however, began about seven to eight years ago when the deployment of cruise missiles in Germany became a public issue. A friend of mine, a colleague at the Technical University and I organized a lecture series (Ringvorlesung) in the winter term 1979/80 on peace education within subject teaching. We asked several collcagues from the Free University of Berlin and the Academy of Arts and Music in Berlin (Hochschule der Künste) to contribute to the lecture series from their point of view, from their subjects. This was the starting point for dealing with peace education in teacher training for me and my institute, too, which gave me a lot of personal and financial support. In 1983, I was a visiting professor to the Richardson Institute for Conflict and Peace Research at the University of Lancaster (UK). Together with Paul Smoker, the Director of the Institute, I conducted a survey on the British Local Education Authorities Policy on Peace Education published as "Peace Education in Great Britain". At present I am going to prepare a comparative study on peace education in Germany and Great Britain as well as our taking part in the "3rd International Workshop on Peace Education" to be held in Ame-

land (NL) which is an event particularly devoted to trainee teachers.

Douglas Ray (London, Ontario, Canada)

My name is Douglas Ray. I work at the University of Western Ontario in London, Canada, in the faculty of education. All of our students are graduates in arts or sciences and they take a one-year teaching certificate. My own background is as a school teacher, mostly in the social studies, history, economic sociology, and political science. I taught in various schools in Alberta, and I have taught in Scotland as well.

Most of my work in peace education came as a graduate student and particularly as a result of my doctoral work. My first experience with the topic of peace education was in the year 1964, when a group of young people gathered from all over the world in London, England, to discuss peace education. One of the members of the group that I was assigned to was Robin Burns, Australia, who was very important subsequently in connection with peace education. When I was working at the University of London I read several articles by Nicholas Hans, who had been very important in defining the early work of international education and international understanding, and my professor was Joseph A. Lauwerys, who had a great interest in this area. Toward the end of my year at London in 1964, I was asked by the UNESCO Institute for Education in Hamburg to participate in a session in Freiburg, Switzerland on education for international understanding, cooperation and peace. These were my first experiences in the field of peace education.

ÅB: And your present work?

DR: My present work is at the University of Western Ontario. Particular groups of students displaying an interest in peace education, for example on Human Rights Day would have some special program. Or when a film related to this area comes out they would try to arrange for every person to see it and have experts comment on it (such as the Helen Caldicott film "If you love this planet"). This is not a compulsory part of the program. Some of the units that I teach in a compulsory part of our program reflect human rights and international obligations for Canada rather than peace as such.

ÅB: Perhaps you could also say something about the kind of research work that you have reported on here at the Rio conference?

DR: Research work that I have been doing for several years has dealt with

international understanding in connection with the UNESCO Associated Schools Program. I have about 20 years experience in this field. More recently I have been working with colleagues in Latin America, dealing with the development of the social studies program for grades 1-7 in Colombia, Peru and Venezuela. We are interested in trying to have something which brings the ordinary person back into history instead of having only the story of big bosses, generals and the giants of commerce and politics. We try to introduce something of the contributions of the ordinary person, the slaves, the aboriginal population, the women, the peasants and so on.

Most recently, I have been working with the Canadian Human Rights Foundation. We discovered that there was very little being done in connection with human rights education in Canadian schools. That did not mean that teachers, parents, school board officials, ministry of education officials, or students were happy with this state of affairs – it was just the reality. They said that somebody should do it and that one should start with the elementary schools. So although the Canadian Human Rights Foundation had never previously done any work in schools (they had confined their work to adult groups: judges, police chiefs and that sort of thing), they decided to work with school curricula. I chaired a committee set up to develop a curriculum unit in this area for use in the schools.

ÅB: It would be of interest to hear a little more about your work related to the UNESCO Associated Schools.

DR: UNESCO Associated Schools were introduced in Canada in 1958 or 1959 in Toronto, but it never got beyond a single individual for several years. In 1965 and 1966 it spread to a network of about 30 schools across Canada. I was one of the program directors for this group of schools, and for a period of about five years we had a very active program in which we defined a lot of things in connection with intergroup relations, human rights and development, that should be dealt with in the curriculum. We were successful not only in demonstrating how it might be done in our own schools, but in persuading the Ministries of Education to broaden this so that it was not just dealt with in the 30 schools of which I spoke, but rather it became part of the required curriculum for literally all Canada. This was in the last part of the 1960s. Shortly after that time the Canadian commission for UNESCO wished to go on with other Canadian activities and they deemphasized the UNESCO Associated Schools. They no longer have the same publicity, but many of the persons involved are still doing this

kind of work, and in fact some of them were involved in the human rights educational program that I discussed about. We keep a personal network to some extent, and through venues other than the UNESCO Associated Schools many of us do things which are consistent with the ideals of the UNESCO Associated School program.

Betty Reardon (New York, USA)

I became interested in this general field in the late fifties, teaching secondary-school students about internationalism. There was a notion abroad then that we were moving into an age in which citizens were having to make decisions about foreign policies and international relation issues and the schools were not preparing them to do so. So I became interested in what was then the major response to this challenge, education for international understanding. Over the years, however, I began to see the inadequacies in the notion of international understanding. In the early sixties I came to consider the concept of peace education, particularly the study of the idea that there had to be some sort of regulatory order in the world in order to avoid violent conflict. When I became School Program Director at the Institute for World Order I moved from that approach into consideration of what we began to call "world order studies" with emphasis on international relationships and problems seen from the perspective of the whole world, using as the basic international policy criteria the human interest or the world interest and emphasizing the long range effects of the policies in contrast to the standard national interest approach. Many of these world order approaches are now standard in peace and conflict studies. The approach did not emphasize conflict resolution, but included the issue of conflict resolution in an inquiry into possibilities for structural change in general.

ÅB: What are your specific interests at present in this area?

BR: I would mention the human rights area, disarmament education, and a feminist approach to peace research, as primary substantial concerns. What I am doing in terms of program development at Teachers College, Columbia University is advanced degree programs in peace education, at the Master's and Doctorate levels. It is not yet possible to take such a complete degree in peace education, but we offer a concentration within other major programs at Teachers College. So graduates are prepared to develop peace

education within standard roles and positions in the educational system. I am also working with other institutions on similary programs and an international consortium of departments and graduate schools of education offering such programs.

Tom Roderick (New York, USA)

I got involved in education through the Civil Rights Movement in the early 60s. I saw education as a way to help bring about equality for African American people in this country, so my first job after graduating from college was to start volunteer tutoring programs; in particular there was one in Philadelphia for African American students there.

I had a Bachelor's degree in History, and then I came to New York and got my Master's from Bank Street College. I started teaching in schools in Harlem. I was educational director of an elementary school in East Harlem controlled by parents, the East Harlem Day School, which we built from a first and second grade school to a full eight-grade elementary school over a period of about eight years. I was associated with the East Harlem Day School from 1968 to 1980.

It was during the late 70s that I became aware of human survival as something that we couldn't just take for granted, but that we needed to secure by conscious choice and conscious action. My generation had grown up in the shadow of nuclear war and nuclear weapons, but the Civil Rights and anti-Vietnam war movements had captured people's energy, and the nuclear threat was pretty much in the background from the early 60s until the late 70s. Then the nuclear issue came to the front of our consciousness as a problem that really needed to be addressed. I realized that the work I was doing trying to build communities for young people and parents in East Harlem was important, but could all go down the tubes, so to speak, if we couldn't deal with some of the human survival issues. The disarmament march in Central Park (in 1982) and my reading of Jonathan Shell's book *Fate of the Earth* pushed me over the edge.

I had thought about becoming director of an alternative school and doing political work on the side. But I realized that I didn't want to do the political work on the side; I wanted to work my way into the disarmament movement and spend all of my energy as directly as I could, working to ensure that we would never have a nuclear holocaust. Having made that

decision, I gravitated toward Educators for Social Responsibility (ESR) because of my background in education. I felt that we needed to educate a generation of young people so that they could rise to the challenges of the nuclear age.

Paul Rogers (Belfast, Northern Ireland)
& Maura Ward (Blackrock, Co. Dublin, Ireland)

MW: I am a member of the Presentation Congregation which was founded in Ireland, principally for the education of the poor. I have been a teacher for 36 years, 18 years at primary level and 18 at post primary level. I had a great interest in the less able students and tried to ensure that even the weakest students had a programme of education that suited them. Consequently I got involved in curriculum development in an effort to provide such programmes. I think it was because of this interest I was asked to become a member of the secretariat of the Irish Commission for Justice and Peace. My main work is in peace education.
PR: I first got interested in the world of peace education about 12 years ago when I applied for a teacher fellowship in peace education which was to be based at the University of Ulster, Belfast. I got that fellowship, and during the year I travelled and investigated what was happening in peace education in the British Isles, in Holland and in America. I visited also the United World College of the Atlantic, in Wales, which was at that time the only school, I think, in the British Isles which offered any kind of peace studies course.

At the end of that year I produced a syllabus for secondary schools and a small teaching booklet to back up the first part of that syllabus which was focused on peace and the individual. The syllabus itself was in four parts, working from the individual, community, national and international level, but I only, because of the time scale of the fellowship, was able to produce teaching materials for the first part of it. When I went back to teaching, I used those materials in my own classroom. Teachers from various parts of the world also used them and gave me informal feedback on their use.

Six years ago, I got an opportunity to do the Master's degree in education, and part of that work meant that I was able to formally evaluate the materials I had produced myself. I wrote a dissertation on peace education entitled "Peace Education - Theory and Practice in the Curriculum". The

first half was a theoretical resumé of peace education and what it meant, and the second half reported on the practical evaluation of teaching materials on peace education in the classroom.

Five years ago the Justice and Peace Commission asked me to be part of the Management Committee of the Joint Peace Education Programme for which I am now working, and three years ago I left school and took up a full-time appointment with that programme as a Peace Education Officer based in Belfast, that is The Joint Peace Education Programme of the Irish Commission for Justice and Peace and the Irish Council of Churches.

ÅB: Could you also tell me a little about the character of your present work?

MW: The Irish Commission for Justice and Peace is concerned with policy, research and education in the fields of human rights, development, justice and peace. The Commission became involved in peace education initially out of a deep concern for the Northern Ireland conflict. It worked to build up a long-term, comprehensive ecumenically integrated programme with the Irish Council of Churches - The Joint Peace Education Programme - which is unusual, if not unique, being an integrated project involving all the main churches operating on an all-Ireland basis across two political jurisdictions. The structure of the Joint Peace Programme itself involves an important peace education process. Both Paul and I work on this programme for the Commission. We work with staffs and students in schools. We give one or two day training sessions to teaching staffs on the promotion of peace and justice in schools. Occasionally we give sessions to students on topics requested by teachers. Teachers contact us for materials and other resources that may be of help to them in school. Because so many have asked us for materials for schools we develop materials on peace and justice for use in both primary and post-primary schools.

This is the process we use in the development of the materials. We plan a series of topics to work on. Every summer we have a workshop during which teachers from Ireland, North and South, Catholic and Protestant, come together and brainstorm on the chosen topics. They work with us for a week during which we worked out a framework for a module or two. Then the three peace education officers work on it and get it ready for piloting in schools. The pilot study takes place in about 20-30 schools to make sure that it is suitable to all types of schools. The materials have to be worked out simultaneously in and for two education systems, one in Northern Ireland and one in the Republic of Ireland. Then, following the

recommendations from the teachers involved in the piloting, we revise the text, sometimes together, sometimes separately, until we bring it to the stage of final publishing.

We have a primary school programme for the 8-12 age group *"Free to Be"*, dealing with the promotion of self-worth and self-awareness and the analysis and understanding of actions and attitudes, awareness of people of other races and faiths, the use of words and symbols, the environment and finally people of peace. It can be used not only in primary schools but also in junior post-primary.

Another programme for upper primary, junior post-primary *"Looking at Churches and Worship in Ireland"* aims more specifically at promoting an awareness and understanding of different Church traditions and breaking down barriers, prejudices and suspicions between students from different religious traditions.

A development education module for 9-13 year olds *"So Everybody Fights"* was published in 1988, on the relationship between world development and world disarmament. It is suitable for upper primary and junior post-primary.

This module covers quite a lot besides development. It also helps the students to understand the concepts as they relate to their everyday lives. It is a very popular programme with teachers.

PR: Our most recent work is on a series of materials for postprimary schools (11-16 year old) called "The Sedekah Peace Programme". "Sedekah" is a Hebrew word which is sometimes translated into English as 'justice' or 'righteousness', but it has a more complex meaning in the original Hebrew which could be translated as "God's power to put things right in human community and in nature".

MW: The first module of this series was "Peacemaker". It consists of eight units, and it seeks to develop knowledge and skills which would help students understand and cope with conflicts at different levels - in their own lives and in the wider society: national and global. Its general aim is to help students to be more at peace with themselves and with others whoever and wherever those others are. It doesn't seek to promote any specific religious or political views, but it does encourage the recognition and development of social skills and values and stresses the importance of a positive self-image.

It is an activity-based program involving the students as much as possible through working on projects, taking part in role-play, group discussions, reaching consensus, and brain-storming. It's a teacher's book, with photo-

copiable work-sheets for the students. We are not in the money-making business; what we really want to do is to promote peace and justice.
ÅB: What would be the age level that you intend it for?
MW: It is intended for 12-14 year olds, i.e. the first and second years in the post-primary school, but it is quite flexible and can be used at different age levels, we think, using different examples. In the Republic of Ireland we find that it is used very much in the Transition Year with 15-16 year olds (after the students take the first departmental examination, the Intermediate Certificate, students take a year to study topics that help them to broaden their horizons before preparing for the next examination). It is also used in work-experience classes e.g. The Vocational Preparation Training Course with 15-16 year old students.
ÅB: How are the units written originally? Are you dividing the writing between yourself, or do you have teachers from the field involved also?
MW: We do the final writing ourselves.
PR: We have groups of teachers working on the ideas in workshops initially, and then one of us takes the major responsibility for writing. Maura (based in Dublin) and myself (based in Belfast) have worked together on our second module entitled "Power To Hurt – Exploring Violence" which is aimed at 12-15 year olds.

Bogdan Rowiński (Konstancin, Poland)

After my studies at the University of Warsaw, the Faculty of Education, I had teaching jobs in different schools for youngsters. Then I changed to study youth problems in a research institute. I started work there in 1986, so I have worked about four years now as a researcher. The general idea of our work has been to answer questions from various bodies of government, and I can also initiate questions myself and try to answer these questions. The questions studied are usually connected with the present situation of our country. From the beginning of my job at the institute, I have worked with peace education.
ÅB: Could you describe a little bit more the work of this research institute and its department of peace education?
BR: The origin of this department is patriotic and defense education. I think that this concept has a longer tradition in Poland than peace education. The questions for this patriotic education usually came from the military ser-

vice, because the idea of patriotic education is to prepare young people to serve their country. Of course, it is difficult to ignore the question of peace education, so recently the boss of the institute decided to develop this problem area, and the term "peace education" was added to the name of our department to make it wider. The leader of the department is a professor of education, and then there are two girls and I as research staff; we all have a doctoral degree.

ÅB: I know that the institute has made several surveys. Could you briefly say something about these surveys; what were their aims and general character?

BR: In general, the aim of the surveys has been to describe youth consciousness, in various areas. In the area of ecology we call it ecology consciousness; in the area of peace we call it peace consciousness; and in the area of patriotic defense, patriotic consciousness. Then a second aim has been to make proposals for educational practice in school programs, for youth organizations and for youth policy. The third aim has been to make proposals to government bodies, for instance the Ministry of Youth or the Ministry of Defense.

ÅB: How do you use the word "consciousness" in this connection? When you say "peace consciousness", for example, how would you define it?

BR: This is quite difficult to say briefly. In the literature there is no such concept of "peace consciousness". We use the term "consciousness" to describe youth attitudes and opinions in general, but then we have measured youth attitudes towards specific areas with specific instruments. When I have measured views in one area, I can use an operational definition of "consciousness" in that area.

ÅB: You use the expressions "patriotic consciousness" and "patriotic education". These are terms which are unusual in Sweden. Would there not be some kind of conflict between patriotic education and peace education?

BR: Yes, there might be, because patriotic education is education which aims to prepare young people to handle arms. In the defense situation they should be prepared to defend their country, and one of the foundations of this attitude is the view of the enemy. You need to have an enemy to prepare yourself to protect yourself against him. In general, in peace education we say there are no real enemies, so this, I think, is a possible conflict between the two concepts.

ÅB: Has patriotic education been a concept used for a long time in Poland?

BR: Yes. It is related to the situation of the two political blocks.

Paul Smoker (Yellow Springs, Ohio, USA)

I came into peace research or peace studies in 1960. At the time I was studying to be a physicist, but I figured the world had enough physicists working with nuclear weapons. We were mainly concerned about the nuclear issue, so a group of us got together and started a peace research center in Lancaster in 1960. Initially, the motivation was the worry about nuclear war.

ÅB: Could you tell me a little more about your center?

PS: At that time a number of institutes had recently started: The Peace Research Institute in Oslo, The Center for Research on Conflict Resolution in Michigan; and the whole movement was just beginning to get going: The Journal of Conflict Resolution, The Journal of Peace Research. At that time – in Britain at least – nobody would have suggested doing peace studies in the university, and the idea of peace education in schools would have been considered quite ludicrous, communistic or unthinkable, I suppose in the same way as sex education in school would have been considered earlier. Over a period, however, the academic peace studies movement, the peace research movement developed, and now the center I work at is an established part of the University of Lancaster.

When the University of Lancaster came to be established in Lancaster, in 1965, we had an independent center going for five years, supported by pacifists, Quakers, peace movements, churches and others. The first Vice Chancellor of that university happened to be a Quaker who had been a conscientious objector during the Second World War, Charles Carter – now Sir Charles Carter. He was also interested in the work of Richardson, and I had been working on Richardson's mathematical models at the peace research center in Lancaster. I used to make my living by playing the piano in a pub at week-ends, and during the week I would work on my peace research extending Richardson's models of arms race.

As a result of Charles Carter's initiative, we moved into the University and we've had a peace study program at Lancaster University ever since. It was the first university in Britain to include it in its program. It has always been a very small program with a small undergraduate course and with a small number of graduate research students doing masters or Ph.D's.

We are still supported mainly by the peace movement. We have "Friends of the Richardson Institute" – and there is about 170 of those; they are a mixture of Quaker meetings, churches, peace groups and some trusts and

foundations, and they provide most of the money to support the institute. The university provides us with rooms, computer time and so on. We are still a very small institute.

Toh Swee-Hin (Edmonton, Alberta, Canada)

I am Toh Swee-Hin. I put my family name Toh first, because I am a Chinese, and that sometimes causes some confusion. Born and raised in Malaysia, I had elementary and high school education there until I received a scholarship to study science and education in Australia. Upon returning to Malaysia, I worked as a science teacher in high school for a few years before deciding to pursue graduate studies in education at the University of Alberta in Canada. Initially, I specialized in the field educational administration, because I had some ideas of going back and try to change the Malaysian educational system "from the top down". Thus, my Masters degree focused on educational planning. However, as further studies exposed me to courses on development issues, I realized that a significant amount of administrative theorizing is oriented in the technocratic paradigm. This increasingly led me away from educational administration to educational foundations including sociological, political and cultural issues in education. So I finished my doctoral studies in the area now referred to as development education.

In the seventies in Canada, development education really grew as a movement. I was also actively involved in the anti-apartheid movement. My own doctoral study examined a U.S.-based think tank that was trying to influence especially American foreign policy. I did a critique of this think tank, its ideology and paradigm of development.

In short, I started in peace education from development and social justice dimensions, and it was only when I began to teach in Australia that my conception of peace education broadened to include the other issues that we now see as part of a holistic conception of peace education. As I developed my courses at the University of New England in Australia, even what I called development education already had issues of human rights, environmental concerns and cultural solidarity as components.

The courses were partly at the undergraduate level for people who would become teachers (in the hope that they would infuse their teaching, whatever the subject, with peace principles and peace pedagogy), but partly also at the graduate level, where practising teachers came in and did part-time studies with me as they were teaching. They did thesis research related es-

pecially to how they would be able to teach about peace and development in their own classrooms. I have been doing that since 1980.

Only recently I have moved to the University of Alberta, Canada, this time to develop programs in what we call global education at the moment. (For me it is the same as peace education.) It's a movement that Canadian teachers through their professional associations, in almost all the provinces have taken up. These provincial Global Education Projects are funded by the official aid agency of Canada, CIDA.

However, I would like to emphasize that my peace education involvement in the Philippines has been quite extensive. I have been going back there twice a year for the past six years working with my Filipino colleagues in peace education.

ÅB: How did it happen that you came to have that contact?

ST: It began in 1986 when I visited the country for the first time as part of my sabbatical leave. Through serving on the Board of Directors of the World Council for Curriculum and Instruction, I had met one of the Filipino educators, Virginia Floresca Cawagas. One of the activities that was arranged for me was to substitute for the Philippine Secretary of Education at a conference to launch a Peace Studies Center in Xavier University in the southern region. She was supposed to give a keynote address around the topic of peace education. I got some ideas together and presented a tentative version of a holistic framework on peace education at the conference. The response of the audience including Filipino teachers, administrators, and community citizens was very envouraging. From then on, I have collaborated with Virginia Floresca Cawagas and other peace educators in the Philippines in elaborating this holistic concept of peace education. In particular, we were able to make close contacts with Notre Dame University, a Catholic university on the southern island of Mindanao, in peace education. "Why don't you come over a period of time and join us in developing a graduate program in peace and development education", they suggested. So that has been happening in the past five years, and our Kyoto paper gives some details on the program and on the process of developing peace education at this university. (Editor's note: This Kyoto paper is now available as Peace Education Miniprint, No. 38.)

Judith Torney-Purta (College Park, Maryland, USA)

I was trained as a psychologist in a department of human development

which was interdisciplinary. In the early 1960's I worked with Robert Hess on a book on political socialization, which was a study of children's attitudes to domestic political institutions. There were no more than one or two questions in it that had anything international or related to war and peace. Of course, this was a particular historical period. The Vietnam War was not yet upon us, and international issues were not very important in the public mind in the U.S.

Soon after that, in about 1969, I received a call from Lee Anderson, a professor of political science at Northwestern University, asking if I would review some research related to children's views of other countries and global problems and issues. That was a rather new idea in 1969. He and James Becker were involved in a project of the Foreign Policy Association, and they had people from various disciplines examining international education. So I began to review the research on socialization that was available. It was about the same time I was starting work with the IEA Civic Education Project conducted in ten countries in 1971. However, I tended to separate my interest in comparative studies of political socialization and my interest in studies of international socialization, or how young people learn about international issues.

Then the Vietnam War became much more prominent. I was married at that time to a pastor. Through the church I did some work on what I would call peace education, from about 1969 until 1971. I collected children's books that related to international issues and peace, and ran church-member workshops to which families were invited.

At various time other people in my university were participating in demonstrations. My response was usually, "let's see what we can do on a long term basis; let's try to understand what young people believe about these issues". There was one group that wanted to shut down the university in a protest to the Vietnam War; I was teaching a very large course in child psychology that semester, 200 students perhaps. A professor from another department walked without invitation into my class and said to me in front of all the students: "If you don't join our protest and shut down this class you are no better than the Nazis." I replied, "I am going to teach this class *about* the problems of children's understanding of world and peace, violence and conflict, and you are *not* going to tell me what I am going to do with my class." So, I didn't cancel the class and we discussed the psychology of children's attitude development toward issues like war and peace. Most of the students appreciated that. They were unsure how to respond. They were happy to have someone say: "Let's relate our knowledge of this

subject to this issue," rather than marching out.

I gave various speeches in those day, but they were almost always focused on psychological issues with respect to children's view of peace – for example, what the children drew in their pictures when they were asked to draw pictures of peace and why.

Then I had a sort of change of views. In 1974 I was appointed to the U.S. delegation to a UNESCO meeting to draft the Recommendation on Education for International Understanding, Cooperation, and Peace and Education relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.

By the end of the 10 day meeting I had decided that the way most delegates were defining peace education, I was not in favor of it. I became extremely interested in human rights, because it was a framework around which I could organize a lot of my interests in international awareness and knowledge. If you are interested in developing countries, you are interested in views about social and economic rights as they defined them. If you are interested in democratic values, you are interested in civil and political rights. I am giving you too long an answer to the first question, but I think it helps explain why I don't consider myself dealing with peace education as such any more. It was particularly in that meeting that debate with the Eastern Europeans showed me that I did not share their view of peace education.

ÅB: What particular view of peace education did you find that you did not agree with?

JT: It was the view that the only thing which was important was to have peace. The more I thought of it the more it became clear to me that a peace which was bought at the cost of human rights was not worth it. Some said that the only thing that is important is not to have war. I don't agree, because there are other rights which are also tremendously important.

Both Thomas Buergenthal, the head of the U.S. delegation at the UNESCO meeting, and I joined the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO the following year. The Commission was 100 people appointed by the Secretary of State from various categories. A very large category is representatives of non-governmental organizations. In some other countries this national commission is actually part of the ministry of education. But in the U.S. there are only a small number of people who represent the government, and the rest are representatives of non-government organizations in science, social science, culture and education.

Professor Buergenthal and I established the Human Rights Committee of this Commission; the committee dealt with human rights issues in general,

not only human rights education. We also wrote a book, *International Human Rights and International Education*, published by the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO in 1976. This was before President Carter proclaimed his human rights initiatives in early 1977. This book is out of date now, but at that time it was a useful summary of US policy, and was even translated into Spanish. It also included a review of the history of international education, going over different approaches such as Lee Anderson and James Becker and their stress on the global approach, rather than relations between nations. It also covered the UNESCO approach to education for international understanding, especially the Associated Schools.

The National Commission organized a UNESCO-sponsored conference which had participants from Finland, Germany, Canada and the U.S. From each country we had one person specializing in international law, one curriculum specialist, one teacher-training specialist, and one researcher. This was an extremely successful conference, and it was an excellent preparation for the large UNESCO Congress on Teaching Human Rights, held later that year in Vienna. By 1980 we had a very strong emphasis on human rights and human rights education in the National Commission for UNESCO.

When the Reagan administration was elected, there was quite a policy change, a clear intent to demonstrate that they had a different approach to human rights from that of Carter. I felt that some of the aims of human rights education were misunderstood. So I decided to go back to my research on young people's attitudes, and I have written almost nothing on international education in general since. This has probably been a good thing for the field as well as for me, since there are very few people doing research in this area and many people constructing curriculum and promoting programs. I am trying to find out through observations, interviews, and surveys how young people develop ideas about the world and its major issues. What are their concepts of international relations and economics, of human rights and national security? I have become especially interested in simulation as an educational tool. I look carefully at the discussions young people have of human rights, and try to understand the dimensions along which they rank countries according to their support for human rights.

Lennart Vriens (Utrecht, The Netherlands)

I am working at the University of Utrecht in the Faculty of Education. My teaching tasks are mainly in the field of general education theory; I have also dealt with nursing and nursing theory. My special topical interest is peace education. During the last 15 years or so, I have been working with research and development related to peace education, and I have written many articles on peace education.

I participated in the development of a peace education project for primary schools involving children from 6 to 12. As a part of my doctoral thesis, I also made a research study of children's daily life experiences of war and peace which was described in one chapter of my thesis. Otherwise my thesis emphasized educational theory, and I am trying to find some kind of new legitimization for peace education: I am trying to prove that education in our time should be peace education, because there has been a very great shift in the world, and I think that most educational theories are essentially based on the situation before 1945. I am trying to build up some basic ideas for peace education from a general analysis of current peace issues, from an analysis of the history of peace education and from my own empirical data.

ÅB: You mentioned earlier two projects that you deal with in your thesis. Is it correct that one of them included developing instructional materials for use in schools?

LV: Yes, we developed some materials, but we did this in close cooperation with teachers, so we tried to find out how teachers could translate some ideas of peace education into concrete materials and pedagogical processes. We try to see this as a dialectic between the child's option and the teacher's knowledge of peace research facts. We were interested in demonstrating how teachers could "discover" peace and war in the life of children.

We took up some general themes, such as conflicts or social justice, but our intention was to be concrete and try to translate those general pimciples or values back to the child's world. So social justice was illustrated via the problem of traffic and children's need of room for a playground. International understanding was dealt with in terms of the problems of children from other countries who attended the school. We had topics like the different roles of the father and the mother in the family as well as the role differences between boys and girls within the family. We tried to do all this so that children would not say immediately: oh, this is peace education; but the teacher would conceptualize it as peace education structures. In our

opinion, knowledge and skills to understand and handle structures are the basis of more direct peace knowledge. Peace (research) knowledge can hardly function without this basis. We were influenced in many aspects by the theoretical ideas of Galtung on structural violence. I do not share Galtung's view that every instance of inequality should be seen as an injustice. Nevertheless, his ideas were helpful.

This project is briefly described in my thesis, and I make a re-evaluation of it, because the project was evaluated in an insufficient way. I tried to reevaluate it in terms of action theory, Handlungstheorie. What we did was try to develop our concepts in reality and try to change this reality at the same time.

ÅB: Is there a more detailed description of this project in other publications than your thesis?

LV: Yes, we assembled a book of materials and a manual for teachers. This manual has four parts. First, we dealt with the theory of peace education. Second, we related it to curriculum theory, demonstrating how you can work peace education into the curriculum. At that time, all the schools were obliged to develop their own school curriculum and to make a document of this; so we said, if you want peace education you can do it in this way, and we presented some ideas about the aims of peace education and how to formulate educational objectives, not only in product terms, but also in process terms.

We had some of the many materials that were developed in the schools, and the schools could take these materials and use them; they had the right to copy them for their pupils. So the teachers were offered ideas, they were offered our philosophy, and they were offered many materials; and then we hoped that they would be in a position to develop their own projects adequate for their own situation. The last part of the manual listed information sources and documents.

ÅB: Could you also say a little bit more about the second study referred to in your thesis: the study of the children's conceptions of war and peace? What were the most interesting or conspicuous findings in that study?

LV: I think one of our most conspicuous findings was that there is indeed a special child culture of war and peace, and that it's additionally complicated because boys have a special boys' culture, and girls have a special girls' culture. This is a complex phenomenon. These cultures are strongly influenced by our adult world problems, but the children have to find their own way. It's not adequate to think that children do not have enough insight into the problems, or that children are not yet capable of understanding the

problems and so on. Children always have to construct some kind of a coherent world view, and they have to integrate what they perceive about current problems into this world view.

A second conclusion drawn in this study is that boys and girls have their own special development as to problems of war and peace – they have taken different positions. Boys seem to be more positive to war, whereas girls are more in favour of peace.

ÅB: Is what you said about sex differences true on all age levels you dealt with?

LV: Yes, it is. However, we did find that both boys and girls of six have great difficulty understanding what is meant by war and peace. They have a vague feeling that war is something threatening and peace is harmony. Older children are more open to the world, and they develop clearer concepts of war and peace. Then we note the differences between boys and girls more easily. At first boys have very positive feelings about war. They like to play war games. They like to be soldiers in their fantasy and they are interested in weapons, real and imagined ones. They like power and strength, and they enjoy violence in television programs. Girls don't like all these things. They don't play war games, they don't see themselves as soldiers, but as victims in wartime. They evaluate violence in television programs as stupid etc. When children are about 11 years old, these things change, especially for boys. Children of that age are well aware of nuclear reality, and from that time on, war cannot be self-evident fun and pleasure any more. Attitudes to war are now more difficult for boys: on the one hand they tend to like war, and on the other hand they realize that real war with atomic weapons is not possible. Girls are more consistent in their negative view of war problems; they are more interested in human relations, and they are more focused on the victim point of view. They say: I don't want war, people shouldn't make war.

I told the pupils about children in the war between Iran and Iraque, and they saw pictures on television. They were very upset, but some boys said that maybe those countries lack many important things and have a lot of children, so perhaps this was acceptable. But the girls said: No, you cannot do this in this way; so girls are very consistent. Girls also tend to have more faith in people, including politicians, whereas boys seem to be more cynical.

ÅB: I understand that, in addition to Dutch children, you also had some groups from Canada and Uruguay. Did you get a similar picture from these other groups?

LV: It's a little difficult to make strict comparisons, since the groups are not quite comparable, and we hesitate to make analyses of cultures which we don't understand fully. Anyway, in the Uruguayan group there was not such a clear difference between the drawings of boys and girls. Maybe the culture in that country is more "masculine". (This was a hypothesis of a Latin-American refugee in The Netherlands.) – A comparison with the Canadian children shows that our children are fairly aware of the international community and feel solidarity with children in the Lebanon and in Northern Ireland. We see less of that in the Canadian material.

Riitta Wahlström (Jyväskylä, Finland)

I am working as a peace researcher at the University of Jyväskylä in Finland, at the Department of Education. My interest in peace education has existed for a long time. Prior to my present work, which deals with peace education in the primary school, I worked with the development of a peace education curriculum for pre-school children. Furthermore, I made a study of young people's concepts of peace and war, level of moral judgement and self-esteem. In this study, I noticed that there was a positive relation between the level of moral judgement on the one hand, and peace activities and positive attitudes to peace on the other.

Zlmarian Jeanne Walker (Brasilia, Brazil)

My name is Zlmarian Walker; I live in Brasilia in Brazil. I am an American by birth, and I have a doctorate in education from the University of Massachusetts. I have lived in Brazil almost 15 years. During the first years I worked in universities in the area of teacher education. At the moment I work in an international school, not affiliated with any government, but in which we have students from 30 countries. In our daily school activities, we try to create a peace education format. I have worked in the international Bahai community, and that is how I became interested in peace education. I have been looking for ways to make it a reality, and I found professionally and spiritually that peace education is a way for me to work.
ÅB: Could you tell me a little bit more about the school?
ZW: A group Bahai professionals in the area of education many of whom have worked in different countries – I think between us we have worked in

8 or 10 countries – decided to start a school that would be in a sense a laboratory for developing peace education concepts and also an opportunity to put peace education in practice, because when you have students from such diverse backgrounds, it's not a luxury but a necessity to try this. – It's an elementary school. About 1/3 of the students are children of diplomats, maybe 1/3 children of other people who work in the international area (in business, for the UN or as missionaries, etc.), and the rest of the students are from regular Brazilian families who feel that they need to have an international kind of education. It's a bilingual school: We work half a day in Portuguese, and half a day in English.

ÅB: And your particular own duties there?

ZW: I am the peace education coordinator, whatever that means, and I teach kindergarten and some subjects in the 9th grade.

Christoph Wulf (Berlin, Germany)

My first encounter with questions of peace education was in the United States in 1970. At that time I was looking at the new Social Studies Education movement. My aim was to make a careful collation and analysis of various efforts within the program of social studies education in the United States. In this connection I met up with questions of peace education. An introductory seminar, to which I had been invited by Betty Reardon and J. Metcalf of the Institute for World Order, made a particularly deep impression on me. Inspired by that seminar, I decided to start something in this field in Germany. Through Saul Mendlovitz I made the acquaintance of Johan Galtung and Dieter Senghaas. At the congress of the International Peace Research Association in Bled in what was then Yugoslavia, we joined together to found the Peace Education Commission. With the help of the German Association for Peace and Conflict Research, which had just been formed, I drafted the program for a first congress of Critical Peace Education in Europe. This congress took place in Bad Nauheim in 1972. It was attended by about 350 delegates from 14 countries in Central and Eastern Europe, the United States, Africa and Asia. The largest group of delegates was made up of teachers and social scientists from the Federal Republic of Germany who were concerned with these questions.

There is no doubt that from that point in time one could speak of a Critical Peace Education activity in Germany. Major themes were: the East-West conflict, the North-South conflict, and environmental pollution.

Richard Yarwood (London, England)

I initially started off as an individual, working voluntarily in development education; I travelled abroad to the third world, and as you do when you come back from those trips, you try to look for how best you can fit in to create change. Being a pacifist I found it difficult working in the fields of development education or multicultural education, because a lot of the people I met there used, at that time, a methodology which was very different from my own preference, so I felt increasingly uncomfortable and moved into work with peace and justice.

I think that education really has to consider the future more than it has done. Visions are crucial to education, and that is one reason why I feel that peace education is something worth being involved in. It seems that young people have a very depressing vision of the future, seeing the nuclear umbrella and the social problems of unemployment, poverty, homelessness, so it's very difficult to try to get kids motivated to form life plans. This is a very crucial area of work for me at the moment.

The Peace Pledge Union as a campaigning organization wants to challenge the fact that violence is inevitable. Some years ago the Peace Education Project was set up by the Peace Pledge Union to concentrate on looking at this problem within the teaching field.

ÅB: Is this supposed to be a permanent activity or is it a project limited to a specific number of years?

RY: It's a permanent project. In our country, about eight or nine years ago, the only paid employees who were concentrated on peace education were attached to education projects related to political pressure groups or non-governmental agencies. Mainly they responded to request by schools to come and give talks, and it was very uncoordinated. Soon it became obvious that the most effective ways to increase that kind of peace education input was either by working through the education system itself to get policy statements and recommendations, or by working directly with teachers and teacher training in order that they can learn the skills, the methods and the content so that they can do it themselves.

Projects attached to groups like ourselves, Pax Christi and The Quakers have been at the forefront of pushing peace education in those ways. It has been most successfully carried out with those local education authorities with a socialist majority.

There has been an interesting discussion over teaching about the nuclear issue. Some argue that the nuclear issue should not be dealt with in schools

because it's far too complicated to understand and anyway it is something that frightens students and that's a reason not to have it in the curriculum. At the same time we know that young people at 18 are expected to vote and make decisions related to nuclear issues. I think that we underestimate the ability of teachers to put issues into a form which young people can understand. Anyway, increasingly young people are asking questions about those issues in school, and teachers need to know how to respond in a responsible manner. Originally, the advise given was that teachers should avoid showing their own position; they should be neutral and wherever possible invite organizations to give different sides. A lot of work has been done during recent years on teaching about controversial issues, and the recommendation now is often that in fact teachers can give their personal opinion and there is advice and recommendations on how they could do that for example, in texts issued here in London (ILEA).

ÅB: Could you say a little more what you are doing here on your particular project?

RY: The aim of the project is to provide advice, training and resources for teachers or others in education who believe that conflicts can be resolved in a nonviolent way. Essentially, we deal with three levels of conflict: the personal conflict, the community conflict (which is where the -isms come in: racism, sexism etc.), and the international conflict. How we would actually integrate with various schools depends on what they want us to do, but this year we have concentrated on producing resources and doing training courses for teachers.

We have recently finished a course called "Coping with conflict in schools". Here we looked at *how* teachers should respond to conflicts in school, not only pupil-teacher conflicts, but teacher-teacher conflicts and teacher-government conflict. Conflicts in school seem to be increasing all the time, and the roots of the conflicts actually often come from outside of the school, that is, they are community-based conflicts. When using this material in teacher courses, we want to make the teachers aware of such facts and to feel that they couldn't be expected to solve all the problems – that there were other people in the community who could support solutions. We also include various methods for solving conflicts. We emphasize the role of students' own responslbility to resolve conflicts, breaking down the hierarchy that exists between people in schools.

So in general, we develop materials and we make courses and workshops for teachers. We give in-puts at various teacher conferences which are arranged. We sell materials to schools.

At the moment we have two major projects which we are working on. One is a project which deals with young children and it's about peaceful conflict-solving, led by Mildred Masheder.

ÅB: In fact, I have already interviewed Mildred Masheder about her work and bought her book, "Let's cooperate".

RY: The other thing we are doing is to produce materials. There is a pack coming out called "War, Peace and Justice" – which is about making the links between peace and justice. We have a whole collection of other resources available.

ÅB: Does your project also involve some aspects of research or systematic evaluation of the material produced?

RY: Not really. We ask for feed-back and evaluation, but I cannot say that we have made any formalized evaluation.

Nigel Young (Hamilton, New York, USA)

My name is Nigel Young, and I was brought up in England during World War II. My first concerns with peace were through peace action rather than peace education, and I went from peace action to peace research. Peace education really began for me in the 60s when there seemed to be a need to disseminate ideas and knowledge. I was teaching at the University of California in the 60s, and I started a course there on non-violence, but also concerned with wider issues on peace. So my first interest in peace education was at the university level. I helped set up the Bradford Peace Studies department. I now run a program of peace studies at Colgate University.